CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 1, 2 & 3 APRIL—JUNE, 1944 Vol. XXXIV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Tension and Prayer

This is a time of tension, not only for the rulers and commanders, the organizers and administrators of the Allied nations, but for the multitudes of men and women whose relations and friends, their 'nearest and dearest,' are confronting danger and death in the invasion of the Continent. Faced with this situation, a bishop has warned our people against self-confidence and boasting. We have not observed either boasting or self-confidence among our British citizens of any class. There is among our people to-day much more of the spirit of Kipling's *Recessional* than of Gilbert's 'he is an Englishman.' Yet there is a spirit of assurance amongst us: but this is not self-assurance—it has a more profound basis than self. It is said that the English are Conservatives, also that they are Liberals, also that they are Democrats; but beneath and above all they are optimists. This optimism is not based on self-confidence, but on the latent conviction that there is Divine overruling in human affairs, and that the Divine Values ultimately prevail in human history. These convictions—scarcely ever expressed publicly except in the pulpit—are sufficiently strong in these times of crisis to inspire our countrymen to stand by these Divine Values, when they are challenged, and even to die for them.

When we contrast our war situation to-day with what it was some five years ago when we declared war on behalf of the Divine Values, we seem to have good reason for this conviction. Things have taken place—such as the entry of Russia and America into the war on our side—which it was quite beyond the power of our statesmen to secure. Yet without these great Allies, our situation

1,34
944/
45

to-day would be indeed precarious. Added to this are the qualities of national character — extraordinary heroism, scientific skill, organizing ability, unrivalled leadership — evinced by our people in the course of the war, which are regarded much more as Divine endowments than as individual acquisitions. These happenings, and this way of regarding them, constitute the foundation of that spirit of assurance and thankfulness from which our present optimism springs. This national faith needs especially at this time to express itself in prayer, and that for two reasons which we venture to state.

First, the nervous tension is intense after nearly five years of war. The most self-disciplined and devoted must at times feel war weariness and inclined to cry out with the souls of the righteous under the altar, 'How long, O Lord?' Conscious prayer in which the whole personality, emotional, mental, moral and spiritual, is unified, is a wonderful tonic in such crises. St. Paul, the most heroic and dauntlessly resolute of men, was also a profound Christian psychologist. Tested by the most intense and agonizing experiences, he prescribed prayer as an alleviation for nervous stress and strain. This is most fully expressed in well-known words addressed by him to his Philippian converts, a community of Roman citizens and retired Roman soldiers:

> 'Be anxious for nothing; but in everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds.'

But there is good reason to believe that prayer can do more than calm the nerves and ease the mind and stimulate the emotions of hope and assurance, courage and resolution. Prayer can effect results outside ourselves as well as inside ourselves; it can influence the course of events — historical happenings. This then, is our second reason for commending the practice of prayer in this time of crisis. The modern man will object, 'Surely you do not believe that in answer to prayer God can or will break the Laws of Nature — the ordered sequence of cause and effect?' Certainly we do not. The modern man retorts, 'What then is the use of prayer about external affairs?' We reply, 'Surely you do not hold that the Uniformity of Nature so circumscribes and restricts the Creator that He simply becomes the slave of His machine?'

Francis Bacon, the father of Modern Science, wrote: 'We rule Nature by obeying her.' This is the secret of the triumph of Modern Science. Just in so far as the scientist obeys the Laws of Nature, he controls Nature and expresses his will through Nature. Of course, to learn the Laws of Nature demands much patient

and accurate investigation by the scientist, but when once he has learnt those laws, and acts in accordance with them, Nature becomes his servant (that is to say, within the particular sphere which the scientist has investigated and within which he operates). Much more will the Creator, who has an infinite knowledge of Nature and obeys Nature's Laws absolutely, be able to control Nature. Hence the Creator is not the slave of the universe, but its operator and master, and so is able to carry out His Creative Will in and through Nature.

The question of course now becomes, 'Will He do this in response to human prayer?' In those cases where our requests are in accordance with the Divine Will we can be sure that God will act according to the tenour of the prayer. The modern man then retorts, 'If this is so, what is the need for prayer? Can we believe that the Creator needs human prayer to enable Him to do things which without that human prayer He could not have done?' Dr. Gore, it seems to us, suggested the right answer to this query, *viz.* that experience teaches us that there are many things which the Creator wishes to give us and which He only gives us if we work for them. Indeed, if we do not work for them the Creator cannot give them to us. The same we believe to be true in the case of prayer. There are many things which God can and will give us if we pray for them, but which He cannot give us if we do not pray for them.

Of course we must pray aright if our explicit supplications are to be granted. That is to say God demands our intelligent and moral co-operation in prayer if our prayer is to be effectual, just as He demands intelligent and moral co-operation in work if our work is to be effectual. Viewing prayer in this way justifies our believing that prayer has wider influences and effects than those which are purely psychological, and that in the present war crisis, prayer—besides relieving our strained nerves and harassed minds —may also have effects in the external world which cannot be either foreseen or measured. The saying of the judicious Hooker, 'Things begun religiously are ended prosperously,' is a good motto for action by individuals and nations facing such crises as those which confront us to-day.

Bishop versus Chaplain General

The following paragraph from the *Times* of May 10 deals with an issue of vital importance to-day:

> The Bishop of Chelmsford (Dr. Henry Wilson), speaking yesterday at the annual meeting of the Christian Evidence Society at Caxton Hall, said that the Churches were up against a great mass of ignorance and unbelief. The wiseacres were always saying that right deep down in their hearts the people of this country were very religious. He did not believe

336793

a word of it. What we had to-day was a sentimental humanism based on a rather vague theism that somewhere there was a God, and if we all did our best it would turn out all right in the long run, and in any case we were all in the same boat, so why worry? That was generally the kind of creed that was popular to-day. He frankly did not believe a word of all the talk that soldiers and sailors were simply bursting with repressed religion. He heard it all in the last war. We were deluding ourselves if we thought it.

Replying to the bishop, Dr. C. D. Simons, Chaplain General to the Forces, said: 'It may not be in orthodox ways that men and women all over the world are reaching out to God. I believe very strongly the spirit of God is moving over the waters.'

Our verdict supports the affirmation of the Chaplain General. Just after reading Bishop Wilson's jibe at the notion of soldiers and sailors 'bursting with repressed religion,' we received a private letter from a military Chaplain abroad, from which we quote the following statements:

'It is fashionable to talk of the "nominal" members of the Church in the army,' the men who sign themselves C. of E. on enlistment or when going sick. But these are not nominal Christians: deep in their hearts is enshrined a practical Christian faith. I have never seen so much kindness or brotherly care for one another as among private soldiers. They may dodge going to Church, but they will do their uttermost to help a pal in difficulties.

'I was very much struck when a foul-mouthed corporal halted our squad, when I was a recruit, and gave us a severe dressing down because someone had dared to use a mild swear-word near the married quarters. Similarly we were in an air-raid shelter on two successive days. On one, only soldiers were present and the language was "blue." The next day, the N.A.A.F.I. girls were in the same shelter and the language was "drawing-room." Our sergeant told the girls: "It's a good thing you were here to-day: yesterday we were speaking French."'

'I've been in action recently, and it was impossible to have Services of any sort as we were liable to mortar fire and there were no trenches, but only holes dug in the side of a hill. I daren't have even two or three standing together in case of a "stonk." When we came out the men said: "It's a pity we couldn't have a Service: you know, we all pray up there, all of us."'

The answer which Christian leaders give to this profound question, 'Are the English people a really religious people, or are they not?' will depend in many cases on the response which the religious leaders have themselves received from those to whom they have sought to teach religion. The controversy is a very old one, and we find it reflected in the Gospels. We have the Pharisees speaking of the 'common people,' the 'people of the earth' as 'accursed.' On the other hand, the Gospels relate of the preaching of Jesus that the 'common people' heard him gladly. The Greek Fathers, holding all men to be in some measure 'partakers of the Divine Reason (Logos),' regarded man as by nature more responsive to the Christian Gospel than did Augustine, whose

iews of human depravity influenced so profoundly and so de-ressingly the estimate of human nature held and taught in the Vestern Church. It is our own conviction that although the British people are a really religious people, yet they are slow to espond to anything except 'the real Christian thing.'

Bishop Wilson is right when he says 'the Churches are up gainst a great mass of ignorance and unbelief.' But is this due o the depraved nature of British folk, or is it due to the failure of he Church in this country to make the right kind of moral and piritual appeal to our countrymen? Our conviction is that the ituation is largely due to the Church's failure especially in the phere of religious education and Christian worship. We have to cknowledge that the Church was faced with immense difficulties vhen called upon by modern scientific and historical research to djust its traditional teaching and its traditional Church services o the demands of modern truth. Liberal Christian educationists, n the face of powerful opposition within the Church, have striven luring the last three generations to achieve the transition from the raditional to the modern understanding and presentation of the Christian Faith. Many of the educated laity, despairing of the uccess of the Liberal and Modernist endeavour, have ceased to e practising Churchmen, although they have not ceased to revere he Christian ideal. Their children, however, having received ittle spiritual and moral teaching at home and perhaps even less t school (we here except the Public Schools), have contributed to hat 'mass of ignorance and unbelief' with which the Church is aced to-day.

How far the Church itself recognizes its responsibility for this 'mass of ignorance and unbelief' is the question. How far it elieves that any radical reform is demanded in its methods of eaching the Christian Faith is also open to question. The general iew to-day is that since 1920 the Christian Religion in this coun-ry has become reactionary and is looking more and more towards Roman Catholicism as its model in doctrine, worship and discip-ine. It seems to us that unless the Church is resolved to go orward under the leadership of the Creative Spirit, and declare ourageously with no uncertain voice that it is resolved to do so, ve shall have no improvement in the depressing religious situation vith which we are faced. We believe in the soundness of British uman nature: we believe in the supreme value of the Christian Religion: but we also believe in the need for new methods in Christian teaching—*non nova sed nove* is an axiom derived from St. Vincent of Lerins. Our situation to-day is like that of a farmer who possesses good land but undrained, and is reluctant to make se of new knowledge and new machinery.

The Primrose League's Attack on Modern Bible Teaching.

The *Oxford Mail* of Thursday, 20th April, 1944, published prominently under large headlines—'Primrose League Protests against Oxford Christology'—the following:

> Dame Beatrix Lyall carried the Primrose League Conference with her yesterday in a protest against the instruction given at a teachers' course at Oxford University which, she declared, 'knocks the very bottom out of everything you and I believe as Christians.' She moved a resolution, which was passed, denouncing 'the teaching being given at a special divinity course at Oxford University for further qualifying teachers to take their part in the new religion in schools campaign as being opposed to the accepted principles of Christianity.'
>
> At this course, which was apparently arranged by the Board of Education, she said, it was stated that modern scholarship had entirely altered all traditional Christianity, and during the course the Incarnation and Resurrection were apparently openly derided.
>
> 'These people,' she said, 'are apparently too clever to believe these traditional Christian doctrines. It was also said at the course that the sayings of Jesus in the Gospel of St. John are not authentic. What sort of religion are they going to leave us? Eighty teachers at this course swallowed all this without protest, and yet apparently they are going to be paid to teach religion to our children.'
>
> Sir George Hume, M.P., seconding, read a letter from a young man who went to the course but left it in disgust. The letter included the statement: 'The course was openly used as a means of propagating the doctrine of higher criticism, and by the end of the week the orthodox Christian faith was denuded of its fundamentals.'

This attack, with variations, received wide publicity in the press. It was, we understand, supplemented by the private circulation of some thousands of leaflets. The lecturer attacked was not named, and we have no intention of naming him here. The statements published are as lacking in accuracy as they are in charity. We must leave our readers to judge of this after considering the following statement of facts.

The lecture-course was attended by eighty teachers, and a protest against the views expressed by the lecturer would seem to have emanated from not more than four of those who attended. The lecture-course was terminated by a devotional service in the College Chapel conducted by a Professor of Divinity in the University. The lecturer, an Oxford graduate, was for some years a Rugby master; he fought in the Great War, was mentioned in despatches, and attained the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel; later he became Headmaster of a school of some 700 boys, in which his care for their religious education was a marked feature—he usually prepared annually some forty or fifty of his pupils for Confirmation. During this period he published a school liturgy, *Prayers, Psalms and Hymns for Schools*. He also published a

Modern Handbook to the Old Testament. In 1933 he brought out *The Four Witnesses: a new study of Jesus of Nazareth in the light of modern knowledge.* After the publication of this volume, his devoted work as a Christian educationist was recognized by Archbishop Lang, who in 1934 conferred on him the Bachelorship of Divinity of Lambeth — a unique distinction for a layman.

In the light of this record, can it be anything else than grievous slander to assert that his teachers' course at Oxford 'knocks the very bottom out of everything you and I believe as Christians'? Rightly the lecturer made ample use of modern biblical research and thus inevitably contradicted a number of fundamentalist traditions. Had his lectures not been of this kind, they would not have received the marked appreciation which was expressed by many of the teachers who heard them. We recognize, while we deplore it, the inevitable conflict which must ensue when new truth and ancient good are found to be in contradiction. We recognize also that the two distinguished public servants, Dame Beatrix Lyall and Sir George Hume, were impelled by devoted loyalty to the Christian Religion to make their protest. We are convinced, however, that they made a profound mistake in making their protest at a metropolitan conference of the Primrose League, and that the Primrose League in publicly endorsing these charges was guilty, not only of political blundering, but also guilty of grave injustice against an undefended and misrepresented individual.

The Church of England used to be described as 'The Conservative Party at prayer.' This is no longer true. It would, however, be an egregious mistake to-day for the Primrose League to identify itself with religious reaction and Biblical Fundamentalism. Bishop Percival, formerly Headmaster of Rugby, used to say it made for stability in the national life when ecclesiastical divisions cut across political divisions at right angles; and he might have added with truth that such a situation also makes for mutual tolerance and comprehensiveness in the religious life of the nation. Furthermore, the recent action of the Primrose League is not likely to commend the politics of the Primrose League to those thousands of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses who are prepared to undertake the teaching of the Bible in our schools, provided they are given freedom to teach it in accordance with the best modern knowledge. If, in their discharge of this extremely difficult and pressingly urgent task, they are not accorded freedom and confidence, then inevitable disaster must overtake the Government's new policy of compulsory religious education.

Professor Gilbert Murray and the World's Needs.

Professor Gilbert Murray's Conway Memorial Lecture,[1] delivered in March, 1944, and just published in full with an introduction by Professor J. A. K. Thomson, deserves attention because its author is not only a superb scholar possessed of the widest and most sensitive classical culture, but is also an international statesman whose outstanding qualities found their appropriate sphere, not in the House of Commons, but in the League of Nations. His Conway Lecture deals with the world's needs to-day.

Dr. Gilbert Murray is not a Christian—so he asserts (p. 28)—but he values the 'precious quality of Christian civilization.' We ourselves should not dare to say that Dr. Gilbert Murray is not a Christian. Of him, as of J. S. Mill, it can be truly said 'Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.' He, however, describes himself as a Humanist; but his Humanism is a Christian Humanism, since he holds by all the Christian values in the sphere of conduct and character.

He desires to see the influence of the Christian Spirit as expressed in civilization and culture, in political and social life, immeasurably extended; but he holds that religious dogmatism, especially when combined with irrationalism and the non-critical treatment of Christian origins and history, is fatal to the advance of that type of Christian civilization of which the world stands in such grievous need to-day. He cannot accept the Christian dogmas literally. For him they come in the class of myth; and, if accepted at all, then like Platonic myths they must be interpreted allegorically and mystically, not literally and dogmatically. He writes:

> 'It is the myth that divides us; and it divides us only when people take phrases that are originally and essentially metaphorical and insist on turning them into dogmas. The only pagan creed that has come down to us, that of the Neo-Platonist Sallustius in the fourth century, begins at once with the myths in which the Greek polytheism was so overpoweringly rich. They are all, he says, allegories; all properly understood can help us in approaching the mystery of the world; many would be highly immoral if understood as statements of fact. Plato, at the end of many of his discussions, comes up against some doubt he cannot resolve, some mystery he cannot penetrate, and regularly falls back on a myth or allegory which, if it cannot say what the hidden truth really is, can at least suggest "by images or metaphors" what it is like. . . . Whenever we attempt in human language to make dogmatic scientific statements about the great Mystery we degrade it much as the Fundamentalists, with their literal interpretations, degrade the magnificence of the ancient Hebrew literature.
>
> Is this attitude too remote and exotic for the plain man? I think not. It is very close to that of the famous Broad Churchmen of my youth,

[1] *Myths and Ethics*, or *Humanism and the World's Need*, by Gilbert Murray, O.M. (Watts & Co., 1944; 1s.)

such as Jowett and F. D. Maurice, and to that of the Modernists. . . . It is, I suspect, practically, though unconsciously, approved by the average intelligent layman, at any rate in Protestant countries. If one can imagine the Mystery which surrounds us making answer in human language to those who turn the myths and images into dogmatic creeds, would it not use just the words of Jehovah's answer to Job: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the Earth? Declare if thou hast understanding. Whereon are the sockets thereof fastened? Have the gates of death been opened unto thee, or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow?"

The dogmatists speak without knowledge; unfortunately, as history shows us, they too often make up for their lack of knowledge by the fanatical passion of their belief. In a world already tortured by fanatics of Left and Right, fanatics of Fascism and Communism, fanatics who have faith in nothing but the promptings of their own passions, it is surely an awful thing for men of good will to reintroduce a religious fanaticism which we once hoped was passing away in peace. . . . We, who believe above all things in Humanity and Truth, and those Christians whose religion rests far more upon, say, the Sermon on the Mount and the thirteenth chapter of *Corinthians* than on dogmas and miracles and magic claims, have exactly the same conception of our duty to mankind, the same vision of beauty to be pursued: and those, I venture to think, will pursue it best who, in the prophet's words, "Walk humbly with their God" and do not profess to know what is beyond man's knowledge.'

We welcome most heartily this 'Eirenicon from Culture.' We desire the achievement of a higher synthesis which will enable the apostles of culture and their disciples to find their moral and spiritual home in the Christian Religion. How to secure this is the problem. Hastings Rashdall once spoke of the difficulty of his task, which he interpreted as keeping the right wing of the philosophers in harness with the left wing of the theologians. But something much more than this is demanded to-day. It is not only the apostles of culture and the masters of scientific research, but also the plain men and women who have to find their moral and spiritual home in the Christian Religion. This is recognized by Professor Gilbert Murray, and he is right when he maintains that the Christian dogmas literally and dogmatically interpreted are responsible for repelling many from the Christian Religion; but to describe the dogmas of the Christian Faith as myths and to interpret them allegorically will not, so we judge, remedy the situation. For Professor Gilbert Murray, as for all classical scholars, the myth embodies latent truth which can only be expressed and interpreted allegorically; but for plain men myth is mere fiction. This being so, the plain man is not going to take Christian myths seriously.

As Modernists, our treatment of the dogmatic problem proceeds along other lines. Our Christian dogmas have all to be re-examined critically. An attempt to do this was made by those Christian scholars responsible for the *Doctrinal Report*. That

Report put on record the diversity of judgement on doctrinal questions which exists among scholars of the Church of England. By doing this the *Report* enlarged — theoretically at least — doctrinal freedom and comprehensiveness within the Church, although we have to add that the clergy to-day, owing to a declining standard of culture, are as a whole less liberal theologically than they were a quarter of a century ago. The critical examination of dogma which we advocate, fearlessly and practically conducted, could have most beneficial results. It would lead to a sound classification of dogmas, in which the great *spiritual* dogmas would come first. These spiritual dogmas cannot be demonstrated to be true by logical argument. We may feel certitude about them, but not certainty. We have not called them metaphysical, although they are metaphysical: but they are also moral and are affirmed or denied by another element in our human personality which is best described as spiritual. It is the personal unity of the intellectual, moral and spiritual which is the characteristic of the human being; and these spiritual dogmas seem to demand and evoke acceptance by the whole personality.

The dogma that there is one God of infinite goodness and wisdom, to whom man owes adoration and obedience and upon whom he is dependent for his existence and welfare, is the supreme spiritual dogma. When, in his treatise *De Testimonio Animae*, the Church Father Tertullian (about 200 A.D.) asserts that the human soul is naturally Christian (*anima humana naturaliter christiana*), he is engaged in arguing that the human soul, when brought face to face with this supreme dogma of the Christian Religion, will always be found to affirm it. Another spiritual dogma affirms that prayer can bring the human soul into communion with God, and that by such communion the soul receives strength and guidance, courage and joy, and the sense of a spiritual companionship.

Then there is another class of dogmas which we may rightly define as *historical*. Whether these historical dogmas are true must be determined solely by historical research. Literary and historical criticism must decide whether such dogmas as, for instance, the Virgin Birth of Jesus, His crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, His physical resurrection, are fact or fiction, truth or falsehood. Then there are *mixed* dogmas, partly spiritual, partly historical. The dogma of the immortality of the soul—or the capacity of the human personality to survive the dissolution of the physical body — seems to us to be of this kind. The dogma, that Jesus Christ is the supreme unveiling of God under the limitations of human nature, finds proof in the appeal that Jesus makes to our moral and spiritual nature; but on the other hand there is the evidence to be considered of whether it is a Jesus of Fiction (com-

parable to the Pagan Christ, Apollonius of Tyana, of whom an idealized life was written by the Philosopher, Philostratus) or the Jesus of History which has provided this revelation of the Divine Nature.

When we re-examine traditional Christian dogmas in this way, we discover how few of the Christian dogmas are essential for the Christian life. We also realize that the spiritual dogmas have all to be accepted, not as certainties, but as working hypotheses. They have to be put to the test by personal practical experience. Hence the Christian Creeds use the formula 'believe in,' not merely 'believe' when confessing faith in the Diivne Father, the Divine Son, and the Divine Spirit.

There is a further point to be stressed. The Church, besides teaching that Christian dogmas are capable of being revised and reformulated, and that the essential dogmas are few and should be accepted not as absolute certainties but as working hypotheses, ought to drop the term *dogma* altogether. The term *dogma* is an offence to many: moreover it is ambiguous; *i.e.* it may mean a fundamental principle or postulate, or it may mean a decree promulgated by authority and enforced by a penalty. To-day, instead of dogmas we had far better speak of the essentials of the Christian Faith and the great working hypotheses of the Christian Life. We are convinced that the revision of dogma and its presentation in this way would prevent its being the obstacle, which it now is, to many men and women of good will becoming whole-hearted adherents of the Christian Religion. The right Christian message for this age is not 'Believe or be damned,' but 'Come and see; this do and thou shalt live; make the experiment and share the experience.'

We do not deny what Professor Gilbert Murray affirms, that the Christian Ethic can be practised without the acceptance of the Christian dogmas: but what we would maintain is that the Christian Ethic is not enough. It needs to be supplemented by the Christian spiritual experience. The essential Christian dogmas treated as we have suggested, would enable the Christian Faith and the Christian Ethic to co-operate in such a way as to increase immeasurably the influence of the Christian Religion in our modern world, and so not only save our civilization but give it a power of moral and spiritual progress.

Our Future Clergy: Their Recruitment and Training.

The Archbishops' Commission appointed to deal with the methods and problems of recruiting, testing and training for the ministry of the Church of England has just issued its Final

Report.* It is a comprehensive document, composed in a large-minded and liberal spirit, and treats the past, present and future of ministerial training in an interesting way.

During the first three centuries which followed on the Reformation, the vast majority of our clergy were trained for their ministry in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin. Somewhat more than a century ago a change began, and Theological Colleges were founded either for the purpose of supplementing the University training or as a substitute for it. During the past fifty years the majority of our clergy have been trained for the ministry in these colleges, which are of two kinds—one for University graduates, the other for non-graduates. These Theological Colleges, as might be expected from those who know the English character, were all created, maintained and endowed by the personal initiative, service and self-sacrifice of individuals or groups of individuals desirous of training the kind of clergy best fitted to serve the spiritual and moral needs of the English nation at home and beyond the seas. In this undertaking the High Churchmen were first in the field, followed by the Evangelicals, and last of all by the Liberals.

Of late years, the Church authorities have sought to supplement these efforts by introducing quinquennial inspection of the Theological Colleges, by instituting the General Ordination Examination for all ordinands, by holding annual conferences attended by the Principals of the Theological Colleges and the officials of the central authority known as the C.A.C.T.M., and by raising large sums of money—chiefly through diocesan organizations—to defray the cost of the training of the poorer candidates. This money is of course not given to the Theological College authorities but direct to the ordinands. The *Final Report* advocates that this centralizing and controlling policy by the official Church should be greatly developed. The centralization policy so far developed has been definitely helpful, and we should like to see it strengthened by substituting triennial for quinquennial inspections, and also by adding one layman to the two clerical inspectors. Serious disadvantages, however, threaten any attempt on the part of the central authority to deprive the Theological Colleges of their power of self-government. If our Theological Colleges lose their independence, they will inevitably lose much of the financial support which they at present receive.

The *Final Report* shows a keen desire to raise the educational level and general culture of ordinands and urges that the

* *Training for the Ministry: Final Report of the Archbishops' Commission*, as presented to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, February, 1944. (Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly; price 2/6.)

fullest use of the Universities should be made in achieving this end. We could have wished that the *Final Report* had clearly and strongly stated that the ministry of the Church should normally be a graduate ministry and that non-graduate Theological Colleges should receive every help and encouragement to become graduate Theological Colleges—not in the sense that every member should be a graduate before admission, but that all should have become graduates before leaving the College for ordination. The carrying out of this policy would almost certainly lead in time to the existing non-graduate Theological Colleges becoming located within the sphere of Universities, which is what we believe the *Final Report* is aiming at.

The proposal to establish two new Theological Colleges within the sphere of the new Universities possessed of Theological Faculties is a sound one, as also is the proposal to found a Theological College in each of the Provinces of York and Canterbury with the purpose of providing refresher courses for the parochial clergy. The proposal to establish an Interdenominational College for the study of ecumenical problems and policies by students of different denominations deserves encouragement; but we wonder where the money for all these new undertakings is to come from in post-war England.

We find ourselves unable to favour the appointment of paid regional committees which the *Final Report* proposes to institute for the preliminary testing, acceptance or rejection of those offering themselves for training as ordinands. The reasons for our objection are twofold:

(1) Our Bishops, Examining Chaplains, Principals of Theological Colleges, and Diocesan Ordination Candidates Committees constitute under our existing system a competent combination for the selection of ordinands, and the services of these officials employed in this sphere impose no additional charge on the finances of the Church. It is true that all those ordained do not attain the personal, social, educational and cultural level which is desired by the laity, but this is due to the quality of those who offer themselves as ordinands, not to any failure in the present method of selection. There is not the slightest doubt that there has been a falling off in the quality of men offering themselves for ordination, but this is due to causes over which those who make selection have no direct control. We recall the following dialogue with a Headmaster of Rugby: 'Are there any in the Sixth who are thinking of ordination?' 'No—none.' 'How depressing in a school with a great Liberal Christian tradition!' The Head retorted, 'You know the causes as well as I do.' The causes, which are many and

profound, arise out of the relationship of the Church to the national life during the last three generations, and it will take much wisdom and courage on the part of the Church if they are to be overcome in this generation.

(2) Our second objection, based on personal experience, leads us to believe that a number of able men would be lost to the ministry of the Church if required to appear before a Regional Committee. To be interviewed by a Bishop is one thing, and the same may be said of an interview with the Principal of a Theological College or an interview with the Secretary of C.A.C.T.M.; but ordinands of the type we have in mind would not face a Regional Committee. Their minds are not made up, and their attitude, due to religious, conscientious and intellectual sensitiveness, is hesitating and tentative. We recall a very able ordinand saying to us, 'I don't know that I can stick it, but I would like to give it a try.' Those acquainted with our English Church History may recall the 'County Committees of Triers' in the days of the Commonwealth and their ejection of a number of the ablest clergy on the grounds of insufficiency. The 'insufficiency,' however, in most cases existed, not in the ejected, but in the Triers.

The proposal of the *Final Report* that all ordinands, besides receiving a thorough training in voice production and public speaking, should also be trained as teachers either by taking a Diploma in Education in a University or by a term's residence in a Training College for Teachers, deserves support from all parties and should be put into operation as soon as Peace comes. The insistence on a certificate of health from the ordinand is usual at the present time, but ordination ought not in all cases to be refused to those who are not strong in body or who suffer from some physical defect. A knowledge of Church History would indicate the folly and loss which must ensue from rigidity in such restriction.

The *Final Report* deals in some fulness with the educational qualifications which should be required from ordinands. It stresses such subjects as Greek, Latin, Church History, etc. It does not, however, specify the Philosophy of Religion nor the prologomena which such a study demands, namely, the knowledge of the History of Religion, Comparative Religion, and the Psychology of Religion: yet a basic knowledge of these subjects is needed to-day by every ordinand. We remember Professor Burkitt saying that when candidates in the Theological Tripos at Cambridge had the option either of the Philosophy of Religion or Dogmatic Theology, they invariably selected the Philosophy of Religion, for they were interested and concerned to learn not what *had* been believed but what *can* be believed to-day. The answer to this ques-

tion is of pressing importance to the modern man; and it is an urgent necessity that the official teachers of Religion should possess qualifications for dealing with it.

Some of the *Final Report's* suggestions for the training of the clergy will remind readers of Don Quixote's disquisition delivered in the Inn on the qualifications needful for a knight-errant. An instance of this is the *Report's* suggestion that future country clergymen should do some work on the land as a part of their ministerial training. This must seem humorous to rural folk. No farmer wants his parson to know anything about farming save this, that what the parson thinks he knows about farming is nothing in comparison with what the farmer himself knows. Country people are sensitive about the country, and do not like those who are not of themselves to talk authoritatively about it. An eloquent city clergyman preached at the Morning Service in a country church a fine sermon on the 'Saving Power of Love.' The congregation was full of gratitude. At Evensong he preached on life in the country. The congregation was disappointed, and said, 'We know all about the country: we would have liked him to tell us about the town.' The ordinand preparing for his rural ministry will find that to be a good cricketer has much greater pastoral value than to possess a practical knowledge of farm work.

What country people desire is that their parson should be kind and courteous, and possessed of good sense and goodwill, cheerful and conscientious, and one who will not change the customs of the church in any degree without the full consent of his parishioners. They like their parson to preach without a manuscript, and that he should have a well-bred and friendly wife; and last, but not least, that *their* parson should be better than the parsons in the neighbouring parishes.

We can only here deal with one point more arising out of the *Final Report.* There seems to us to be a tendency in the *Report*—as there is a tendency in our modern Church life—to restrict too much the freedom of the ordinand, whether in the selection of his university, his theological college, his diocese, his curacy. Of course circumstances compel inevitable restriction; but our authorities should allow our young men as wide an exercise of choice as possible. An uncongenial decision in these matters forced on a young man by authority can have most disastrous results. The financially dependent ordinand ought to have the same freedom of choice granted to him as is exercised by the financially independent ordinand. No generous-hearted layman would wish it to be true of financially dependent ordinands that

> 'Chill penury repressed their noble rage
> And froze the genial current of the soul.'

The Last Challenge of the Patriarch Sergei.

Russia has suffered a grievous loss by the death of the Patriarch Sergei, by whose unflinching courage and patriotic statesmanship the Orthodox Church—after the terrible experience of persecution and oppression—was restored to her former position as the Church of the Russian people. Sergei had to face much misunderstanding in his accomplishment of this great task; but it must have been no little joy to him to have achieved it ere he passed hence on May 14.

His last utterance challenged once again the Roman Church to justify the claim of the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ, since it is on this claim that the Roman Church bases its age-long endeavours to undermine the authority of the Greek Orthodox Church and alienate its adherents by establishing Latin Patriarchates in the very heart of its great sister communion. The protest of Sergei, supported by the Russian Government, is briefly summarized in the following excerpt from the *Observer* of April 16:

> The Russian Orthodox Church, recently restored to prominence by Marshal Stalin's agreement to revive the Holy Synod, has now restated its age-old challenge to the Roman Catholic Church and to the Pope in particular. The challenge was delivered by the head of the Orthodox Church, the Patriarch Sergei, in the latest copy of the Moscow *Church Bulletin*. The Patriarch's statement does not only show that the revived Holy Synod remains faithful to Orthodox tradition. It also has an important political significance. It shows that there is no likely divergence of views between the Synod and the Soviet Government. The doctrinal attack of the *Church Bulletin* on the Vatican follows a political attack on the Vatican by *Izvestia*.
>
> The title of the Patriarch's statement is, 'Does a Vicar of Christ exist in the Church?' The Patriarch replies, emphatically, 'No.' 'In the Patriarch's view the mystical marriage between Christ and His Church renders the existence of an intermediary Vicar of Christ on earth altogether inconceivable. . . . The Gospel teaches us that our Lord Jesus, while quitting the world bodily, had no thought whatever of handing over His Church to the care of anyone else. . . . He has sent his Apostles and their succesors, the Orthodox Bishops, that they may preach the Gospel and lead the faithful.'
>
> The Patriarch utters a warning against placing too much confidence in the temporal and material organization of the Church. He is clearly content to render unto the Soviet Caesar the things that are Caesar's.
>
> In the light of these attacks by both *Izvestia* and the *Church Bulletin*, recent rumours about a Concordat between Moscow and the Vatican appear to be idle stories.

Students of Church History know how from the fourth century onwards the rivalry between the Pope of old Rome and the Patriarch of new Rome (for so Constantinople is termed in the Canons of Nicea, 325 A.D.) troubled and weakened Christendom. The Patriarchs of Constantinople were not entirely blameless. Towards the end of the sixth century, John the Faster, Patriarch of Con-

stantinople, styled himself the ecumenical or universal Bishop. Such a claim provoked the indignant protest of his contemporary, Pope Gregory the Great (who, it will be remembered, sent Augustine to England). The *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Vol. II, p. 785, describes the conflict as follows:

> 'The title Gregory called foolish, proud, pestiferous, profane, wicked, a diabolical usurpation: the ambition of any who assumed it he compares to that of Lucifer; and intimates that its assumption was a sign of the approach of the king of pride, that is Antichrist. His arguments are such as to preclude himself as well as others from assuming the title, though he implies that if any could claim it it would be St. Peter's successor. Peter, he says, was the first of the apostles, yet neither he nor any of the others would assume the title universal, being all members of the church under one head, Christ. He also states (probably in error) that the title had been offered to the bishop of Rome at the Council of Chalcedon, and refused.'

In later centuries, however, the Popes became the aggressors and made stupendous claims to authority, culminating in their assuming the title Vicar of Christ, carrying with it supreme authority over the whole Christian Church.

To this Roman claim the Orthodox Church has never bowed. As a consequence it has suffered much at the hands of the Papacy. That the last public declaration of the Patriarch of the great Orthodox Church of Russia should have been to challenge the Papal claim indicates how much the Orthodox Church has to fear from Papal propaganda and intrigue. The fact that Poland is under the Papacy has done not a little to embitter the relations of Russians and Poles, and, we fear, will continue to do so. The Papacy is Totalitarian in the most absolutist sense: in a world striving for freedom — political, social, economic and religious — this last challenge of the Patriarch Sergei must be renewed until the usurper yields to the claims of Christian love and Christian freedom. If such a surrender on the part of the Papacy be regarded as outside the bounds of possibility, then other forces at no distant date will assuredly secure a surrender of Papal claims and extirpate the policies of political intrigue which these claims foment.

Experiments in Public Worship.

The Deans of St. Paul's and Liverpool have undertaken the editing of the series of volumes dealing with 'Problems of Worship.' The first volume of this series, entitled *English Prayer Books*,* by Stanley Morison, is of real value because it combines in a remarkable degree a knowledge of the past history of public

* *English Prayer Books: An Introduction to the Literature of Christian Public Worship.* By Stanley Morison. (Cambridge University Press, 1943; 6/-.)

worship in this country together with a realization of our present needs in that sphere. We need many new Services, particularly what may be called Guild Services or Vocational Services, which are essentially services for the worshipping laity seeking Divine blessing and guidance on their occupational lives. Such corporate services may be annual or seasonal or even monthly. The point is that they are pre-eminently lay services in which, if the clergy take part, they do so under lay direction and, in certain cases, with the co-operation of lay officials.

The framing of these Services in a number of cases has been done by a body of laymen acting under the chairmanship of a competent liturgist. The laymen in such cases voice their needs and desires; they decide what they wish the service to be and to do for them, and also where and when it is to be held and who are to officiate at it. Services of this kind secure the interest and support of the laity to a degree which is not usual in the case of our normal Church Services.

We observe from examples supplied by Mr. Morison that many conventional elements in our Church Services are absent from these Vocational Services. There seem to be no *Glorias*, no *Kyries*, no frequent repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, no Lesser Litany, no penitential element, no recitation of Creeds. Responses play a large part; and the chief prayers are considerably longer than our ancient Collects and lack their precision and balanced construction. There is, however, in these Vocational Services a spontaneity and originality, a homeliness and simplicity, and an emotional element touching 'men's business and bosoms' most nearly, which we do not normally experience in our routine Public Worship. The clergyman accustomed to the precision and distinction of the diction of the Book of Common Prayer is apt to feel as he peruses these Services much as a lover of Milton and Tennyson would feel when he first reads Walt Whitman. But of course we do not enter into the spirit of a service of Public Worship simply by perusing a printed document in our study. We need to take our part with the congregation which renders it in Public Worship.

The following citations from Mr. Morison's little volume will add point and vividness to these generalizations.

> 'Perhaps there has been overmuch "quoting out of Scripture" and overlittle use of the vital and creative contacts of daily worship with daily life. There has, perhaps, been overmuch concern with revivalism, *e.g.* of the Uses of Sarum, of Lyons, or of Toledo, and overlittle new expression of contemporary needs.
>
> The building of a library, even a library for liturgy, will hardly avail to our salvation if it leads only to the publication of quartos on the liturgical colours of the fourteenth century and monographs of the purely

archaeological sort. As the bibliography proves, there has been no shortage of scholarship during the last two centuries, and our sketch of liturgical history will have been very little to the purpose if it should lead only to a mere "escapist" study of the old service-books. There are other antiquarian purposes to be served which the genius of the liturgy permits and encourages. If we are right in thinking that the liturgy has a future as well as a past, we have reason to count ourselves fortunate that the elasticity of the responsoral element in the liturgy makes it easy for public worship of that kind to participate more and more closely in the general social impulse so characteristic of our time. The elements for a syndicalization of liturgical worship, *i.e.* a restoration of contact with the crafts, are not lacking' (pp. 110-111).

In dealing with modern liturgical efforts of a popular kind, Mr. Morison writes:

'In fact highly successful services expressing the intercessions and thanks of particular groups of men and women banded together in work of social value have been held. I have before me several admirable examples, well enough printed, of offerings of worship which are the result of consultations with those who are closely associated with the avocations which the services were designed to commemorate, *e.g.* the fathers of a metropolitan city, the Naval and Merchant heads of a great port, the chiefs of the R.A.F., the leaders of Civil Defence and wardens of A.R.P. services. Such services, whose responses and litanies were drafted under the supervision of an authorized and instructed liturgist, with the help of the laymen concerned, expressed the worship and held the human attention of these several congregations for which they were arranged. To the essential requirements, *i.e.* of liturgical propriety and dignity of language, there was added vocational appropriateness. There was, it will be noted, little real novelty in the functions. The combination of thankoffering and petition is as old as the Temple and the Synagogue. The novelty consisted in the officers and men of the Royal Navy and Merchant Navy being given the direct opportunity to assist in the drafting of the collects and responses. On the occasion of the special Liverpool service held in 1930 affirming the Port's Kinship with the Sea, the praises of God were sung by men who had the best of reasons for appreciating the significance of the responses. . . . Vocational services so drafted have survived the test of use in a large building, and that, not in one year only, but in several' (p. 113).

Mr. Morison concludes his treatise as follows:

'In sum, it may be said that future liturgical discussions will differ in motive and object from those of the recent past. The Anglican Dean's comparison of liturgiology with stamp-collecting implies scorn for the frivolity he thought recognizable in men who satisfied an appetite for ceremony-mongering and dressing-up while evading the real problems of Christian worship. It now looks as if the millinery and play-acting stage has been passed. Liturgiology can no longer be identified with a programme to restore public worship into conformity with such conventions as east-windows, oak screens, elongated chancels and four-poster altars. To-day there is a new realization by those who profess a religious affiliation that public worship needs to be made more vital for more people. Moreover, there is a new realization on the part of those who make no religious profession that the retention by the Christian religion of its present influence in this country requires the expression of its faith and worship in contemporary terms' (p. 126).

A Free Church Ultimatum.

The Rev. Dr. Townsend, President of the Free Church Federal Council, in his Presidential Address delivered on March 27th, 1944, and published under the title *The Ground We Stand On*,* is clear and uncompromising on all the main issues.

> 'We know the urgency of theological re-statement and we welcome all such enlightenment. But many doctrinal errors of the Church must be examined in the light of the Christian Ethic. . . .
>
> I cannot see the promise of spiritual revival until the Church repents and confesses her moral failures before God and men. Yet, there are few signs, if any, that we are preparing to subject ourselves to the most ruthless self-examination. . . .
>
> The Church is burdened by traditions which would have been ridiculed out of existence long ago in any other field of knowledge than theology — yet, in conferences, speeches and books, these traditions are assumed and meant to be conserved. Appeals for Christian union and for organic union have almost become a slogan, but a slogan is no substitute for incisive criticism of tradition and of the political and social failures of historic Christianity. The way of the Lord in this generation must be prepared and paved by fearless criticism and honest religion.'

Dr. Townsend is an unflinching anti-sacerdotalist and anti-prelatist.

> 'The existence and rule of the priestly order in the Church have been a moral offence which God has judged in history and is unmistakably judging in our own day. In East and West these priestly rulers have maintained a vested interest in the ignorance, poverty and economic slavery of the masses: nor will the world be rid of these evils until it is rid of these vested interests. In Tzarist Russia, Italy, Spain and elsewhere, no one can measure the appalling responsibility of the priestly caste for the moral failures of the Church.'

Dr. Townsend is also utterly opposed to the alliance of the Church and State. Such alliance he believes to be the source of many evils. Having reviewed the evil results of the alliance of Church and State in our English history, he comes down to modern times and deals with the evils arising from the alliance of the Roman Church with the Fascist Powers, particularly in Italy and Spain. He asks:

> 'Can the Roman Church, in its present form, survive the world judgment which has moved against her? The Reformation of the sixteenth century was a deep wound in her body, but the spiritual, moral and political forces moving against her to-day are on a far vaster scale.
>
> British democracy, attacked by Christopher Dawson and Roman Catholic Editors in this country, has now risen from inertia and beaten Fascism to the dust. The insolent mask of Mussolini has been torn away. The Italian nation is reduced to shame, rags, poverty and desolation. In the midst of this retribution can the Vatican continue as if these things had never happened? Will the verdict of history exonerate this Church which was allied with a government founded on terror and lawlessness? How can this Institution hope to wash its hands in innocency?'

* *The Ground We Stand On.* Published 27 Tavistock Square, W.C.1. Price 6d.

Dr. Townsend declares of himself and his fellow Free Churchmen :

> 'It is our High Churchmanship which leads us to stand for the freedom of the Church from State control and alliance. Let anyone explore this ground on which we stand : he will discover that our fathers fought for this High Doctrine of the Church when they had everything worldly to lose.'

Dr. Townsend then proceeds to show how much this country owes politically and socially to the Free Churches. He cites with effect the recent statement of the Master of Balliol :

> 'It is in these communities that we must trace the rise of political democracy in Britain. The inspirers of democracy in seventeenth century England were the Anabaptists and the Independents and finally the Quakers. This, not because they had taken more literally and centrally than others the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, but because they had insisted on the self-governing congregation. That meant that they had daily experience of a fellowship united in a common purpose beyond themselves, to which purpose each and every member was found to have something to contribute.'

The Church of England was certainly slow to awake, but her resources are such that no Free Churchman to-day can fail to recognize her influence for good in the great work of social reform. We should have liked Dr. Townsend to have recalled in one brief sentence that with the great Evangelical movement the Church of England became a powerful influence in the work of social amelioration. It was William Wilberforce and the Clapham Sect which was mainly instrumental in freeing the slaves. It was the Earl of Shaftesbury—the great Evangelical Churchman—who put an end to the cruel employment of young children in the mines and mills. It was such well-known Churchmen as Frederick Denison Maurice, Thomas Hughes, Charles Kingsley who created the Christian Social Union—supported in its earlier days by the Broad Churchmen, but later led by such High Churchmen as Charles Gore and Scott Holland.

The latter part of Dr. Townsend's address dealt with our 'unhappy divisions' and the terms on which alone organic union can be secured between the National Church and the Free Churches :

> 'I appeal for the acceptance of our churches and ministries as equal in Christ. Unless this recognition is granted, may I suggest that appeals to Free Churchmen for organic union shall cease? We cannot surrender principles which are rooted in the New Testament and vindicated in history. The time has passed when we were competing sects. It is a fact that we are divided; but we can co-operate and "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." For the sake of the spiritual and moral resources essential to the revival and reconstruction of Europe we ought to co-operate. And as we pursue the objective ends for which the Church exists, it may be that barriers will break, and a new church arise, more worthy of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

The Lambeth Conference of 1920 whole-heartedly acknowledged the validity and the spiritual fruits of the various Free Church ministries. Unfortunately the English Church has come short of acting in the broadminded and large-hearted way which the Lambeth affirmations demanded. 'Organic union' between ourselves and the Free Churches is faced with great practical difficulties; but we fail to see why, since 1920, there should not have been intercommunion between ourselves and the Free Churches as a matter of course in all parishes, and also why there should not have been frequent and friendly interchange of pulpits between English clergy and Free Church ministers. But our Anglo-Catholic brethren 'queered the pitch.' Our Bishops were alarmed lest there might be a new secession from the National Church, and so the great Liberal declarations of 1920 have shrunk into the meagre practices of 1944.

We hope, however, that the Peace to be will recreate in our English Church the Liberal Christian spirit of 1920 and that our Church policy will conform to our Christian declarations. Meanwhile, there is a great field for Christian co-operation, and much has been done in that field during the war and will continue to be done.

We cannot end our comment on Dr. Townsend's address without a reference to his condemnation of Establishment. The Church and State are too closely interlocked in our British Constitution to make disestablishment either desirable or practicable to-day. Dr. Townsend seems to ignore the fact that it was not Charles I who rejected the Prayer Book Revision of 1928; nor was it the House of Lords; but the most democratic of all our institutions, the House of Commons; and the Dissenters in that House played no small part in that rejection which conferred — as is recognized by most Churchmen to-day — a benefit both on the Church and nation. May we also point out that it was not Charles I but our democratically elected Prime Minister, who was responsible for the appointment of Dr. William Temple, the most democratic of our Primates.

Dr. Townsend will therefore forgive us if we regard his attack on Church Establishment as *doctrinaire* and *démodé*. To-day, in England, whatever may have been the case three centuries ago, the union between Church and State is as beneficial to the cause of democracy as it is to the influence of the Christian Religion.

Does Dr. Townsend, we wonder, prefer a Disestablished Church, a secularized State, a sectarian and clericalist religion or that ideal which Mr. Bernard Shaw sets forth in *John Bull's Other Island?* 'In my dreams heaven is a country, where the State is the Church, and the Church the people: three in one, and one in three.'

LIBERAL THEOLOGY AND CHURCHMANSHIP*

By the Rev. James Parkes, M.A., D.Phil.
(John Hadham).

I.

IT is only possible fully to define liberal churchmanship by contrasting it with the alternative attitudes adopted by Christians, both now and in past ages. In itself I would call it that churchmanship which seeks continually to keep its beliefs and practices abreast of the age in which it is living; and which, firm in its essential knowledge and experience of the fellowship of men with God, does not fear to re-examine its doctrines or adjust its practices to the needs and discoveries of each generation as they are made manifest. It might seem that such would be the natural attitude and practice of all Christians, but there is no factual justification for such optimism. For, on the one hand, there are the conservatives, far more prominent among both ecclesiastical administrators and church-going laity, who fear and distrust change, especially at moments when the demand for change is particularly insistent; and, on the other, there are those, also far more prominent than the liberals at a time of crisis and disintegration, who find spiritual security in escape, in 'going back,' whether to the systems of the Thomists and Calvinists, or to the stress on transcendence by the mystics. In consequence we have the conservatism and caution of the bishops and the various assemblies of the churches, and the fantastic doctrines of the many schools of escapism, neo-Thomists, Barthians, and others, occupying a far more prominent position in religious circles and in the popular mind than the unorganized and less vocal liberals.

But there is no salvation in these alternatives. The changes which have taken place in the spiritual and social structure of society during the last 150 years are far too profound for any religious revival to succeed without taking them into account; and these changes are not only far too profound, but also far too attractive. There is no hope in the conservatives, for the task of religion is not to maintain certain established values against a world which is assumed to be inherently hostile or indifferent to them, but to lead the world; not to restrain progress, but to direct it; and there is no hope in those who 'go back,' for there is no going back from the greater to the less. And in comparison with the

*A paper prepared for delivery at the cancelled London Annual Meeting of the Modern Churchmen's Union, May 31, 1944.

possibilities of the world of to-morrow, the world whether of the Middle Ages or of Barth is so pitifully small and poverty-stricken to any except those who have hypnotized themselves with its false values, and gained the meretricious strength which always comes from blinkers, that it is impossible ever to imagine men turning back with joy to its exploded philosophies, its pompous bogey of a godling and its caricature of man.

But if there be no hope except in those who call themselves liberals, there seem too few even among the liberals who realize the uniqueness and immensity of their task and the full scope of the adventure to which they are committed. For the task is nothing less than the rescue of Christian knowledge and experience of God and of the ways of God with men from a whole system of historical and philosophic thought, embodied in traditional institutions and observances, all of which alike belong to an age which men have rejected, or are rejecting, because of its obvious untruth, its inadequacy or its incompetence. No religion has ever faced such a task before, and for no religious system is the task more difficult than for ours. For Christianity is inevitably anchored to a certain point in space and time by its central doctrine of the incarnation of God in history. But just because it was a real incarnation in history, that incarnation was itself rightly and inevitably conditioned by the age in which it took place. And now that age has passed away. The narratives which recorded and interpreted the event have alike lost their absolute authority. We might still believe that everything in the records is true; but we would no longer believe it merely because it is in the records; and the difference is fundamental; for the centre of authority has shifted from the records to our judgment of them, and can no longer be shifted back.

It is not surprising that in such a situation men should prefer to seek to preserve what they have, but the problem thus created grows more insoluble every year that such a position is maintained. For religion may flourish under persecution and thrive from attempts to suppress it; but it cannot survive the contempt of the intelligent, and the perpetual exposure that in its official formulae and accepted usages it teaches and proclaims doctrines in which it does not believe. And that is the position into which the conservatives have brought the churches. The result is the present ignorance and apathy of the general population, and the increasing discomfort and rebelliousness of the livest elements within the ministry.

Nor is it unexpected that others, confronted with that apathy and contempt, should seek self-justification in a passionate assertion that religion is so wholly other that those without the fold are incapable of sound judgment or clear understanding. These

Barthians and pseudo-Barthians would not matter had we not to face the practical fact that, under the influence of the ecumenical movement, we shall be invited, after the war, especially to admire the doctrines of those Christians who have found an eleventh hour ability to resist Nazism in a courageous reassertion of the absolute authority of a transcendent God. It is no question of belittling their courage, but it will be ignored that to a large extent they are drawn from those elements in the churches which were most hostile to the liberal tradition, even to the extent in Germany of supporting the Nazi overthrow of reason right up to the moment when the Nazis turned upon their churches. The far more consistent resistance of political and religious liberals, socialists and communists, who from the beginning were never deceived by the pretensions of the Nazis, and whose resistance has been even more enlightened while no less courageous, is usually ignored in ecumenical circles. And it is pathetically true that such movements as the Confessional Church in Germany may attract the admiration of Christendom while they are a persecuted and resistant minority, but they would be disastrous in victory. For they are wholly devoid of any healing or creative doctrine for a twice-humiliated nation living in the twentieth century.

II.

But if we are to go forward, it can only be on a much deeper and wider front than that on which liberalism has so far mustered its forces. It is not to-day a question of biblical scholarship or of the study; of the prudent questioning of theological doctrine in the lecture-room, and the omission of the more archaic and unattractive expressions of belief in the church service. Nor can the task be undertaken by isolated individuals each advocating his personal panacea, or re-writing, however sincerely, his own version of the Catholic faith. The theological task to-day is pastoral; and it is time that we realised that there is no salvation in single admirable pastors. We ignore the lesson contained in the fact that the individual apostles were men of such outstanding unimportance that we have no record whatever of any of the activities of three-quarters of them. What attracted was the message; what drew men was a way of life. We should take no comfort in the successes of individual vicars or broadcasters. We have been far too satisfied to substitute the word of the ministers for the ministry of the word. Of course there always will be, and should be, men who are outstanding in their generation, but when at present challenged, we do little more than parade the successful vicar of Little Duddenhoe as though his success excused the empty churches of Greater London.

I should like to emphasize this point again and again. The time has come when nothing but a corporate effort can meet the

situation; individual pioneers have done all that they can be expected to do. They are in two senses impotent to take the next step; so long as they remain individuals they can only offer the word of an individual, and the word of no individual is adequate to our needs; and so long as they remain isolated they can be crushed or extruded by the forces of convention. But when I say a 'corporate effort,' I do not mean that we must wait until the whole Church is ready and united for another step forward. We have got to face the difficult demand that arises from the fact that progress is rarely the result of united action — historically, it has never been the result of united action in the sphere of religion, in which for honourable as well as other reasons the weight of tradition is heaviest and the counsels of prudence most likely to appear reasonable.

The grounds on which it is legitimate to raise the call 'Come ye out and be ye separate' must be weighty grounds. I believe they are weighty. The need must be urgent. I believe it is urgent. The alternatives must have been tried and found wanting. It would be difficult to think of an alternative which has not been tried, and the world of 1944 is enough evidence that they have been found wanting.

I cannot conceive of a situation which should present a more urgent challenge to the Churches. It contains two elements, one positive, one negative, independent of each other, and each in itself making an imperious demand upon us. On the one side is the challenge of communism and the Soviet Union. That challenge is a positive one, and we can leave to the Romans the futility of continual, negative denunciation. On the other side is the depersonalization of man, his loneliness and bewilderment in a world which is too vast and likely to become too planned to take note in itself of those isolated units each of which contains an immortal soul. The conservatives have failed to meet either of these challenges; the transcendentalists have failed to escape them. The ordinary man, unlike Pilate, is waiting for an answer to his questions. Are the liberals prepared to make the necessary effort, and have they the necessary courage, to give answers which the world will recognize as relevant to its needs? There are many questions which they will have to consider, and their answers will be useless until they have discovered how to embody them in all the elements of a liturgy which men, whether they live in Gateshead or in Devonport, whether they be industrial or professional workers, must find available in some local place of worship.

It is not that no parts of the present services are relevant to men's needs. But, as a whole, they belong to an age which is dead, and it is impossible to separate the elements which belong to the dead age from those which are still spiritually creative. In

prayer and psalm, in hymn and Bible reading, we are constantly compelled to repeat, and to ask others to repeat, sentiments which we neither believe nor desire others to believe. It is right that public worship should be many-sided; but Christianity has never supported the vague views of the pantheists and others that everything is equally true, and all conceptions of God equally valid if sincerely held or sung to a good tune. Christianity is a creed which has dividing lines, which believes some things to be true and some to be false; its picture of God, man, and the world he lives in is supposed to be a clear-cut and compelling picture. It is this clear-cut picture, which men may accept or reject, that our services should express in terms of the thought-forms and problems of contemporary man. A local congregation cannot permanently live apart from its local services. And this is so important that it may be said to-day that the problem of liberal theology is the problem of liberal churchmanship.

III.

In many major fields there has been so radical a change in our way of thinking that we must express either the old order of things or the new; the same statements cannot be applied indifferently to both. To-day I would select only four.

The many discoveries connected with the theory of evolution, and the work of biologists, anthropologists, mathematicians and astronomers have introduced us to a world far more splendid and more orderly, far more free and yet far more casual, than was imagined by the authors of the Bible and of all the period which preceded the scientific revolution. In relation to the world as we know it to-day much of the old imagery is irrelevant or actually misleading. Creation was an act of intelligence, not an act of power; the government of the world is not an absolute monarchy, but an infinitely elastic and subtle co-operation between God and all the orders of creation; power itself implies responsibility, and this must affect our teaching of the Incarnation and the Atonement. Moreover new expressions of God as creator need to be linked to new expressions of God as person, expressions largely emptied of monarchical epithets, and widened to include qualities of the intelligence and the will as well as those of the emotions. The central relation to the God revealed by modern knowledge would be expressed in a prayer for guidance rather than one for mercy. Nor is it enough that such 'modern' ideas should be occasionally expressed. Doubtless they already occur here and there in our liturgical uses. They must be continually and consistently expressed; and the necessary emphasis on humility, on our failures to respond to God's demands, our sins and ignorances, must be

related to the conception of a co-operative commonwealth rather than an oriental sultanate.

Our second problem is, as Maritain has said, that our archetypes have gone. Many have become meaningless or actually deceptive. To describe God the Father as king, God the Son as lamb, God the Holy Spirit as dove are to-day misleading metaphors. They convey no immediate picture to men of this democratic, urban age in which children do nature study. Even the phrases God the Father and God the Son need as well as offer explanation. They do no harm to those who are already accustomed to the traditional phraseology of the churches, but they will not in themselves attract those not brought up in traditional ways by the sudden light they throw on the nature of God. The primitive association of blood with life: sacrifice as a ritual act: redemption from slavery as the renewal of relationships: none of these are to-day creative phrases shedding illumination on the actual problems and needs men feel. Those of us who are ministers, or regular church-goers, are so accustomed to them that we can with difficulty appreciate what a meaningless jargon they are to those outside. They are barriers, not guides, to the truths we would convey.

Our third problem is that men have changed their method of seeking truth. It is no longer relevant in vast fields — fields which we ought not to ignore in our religious teaching — to tell men to go to the Bible for inspiration and guidance. They will get more truth in a Blue Book or a Penguin, and very likely the right thing to tell them would be to do a little research for themselves. It is useless to ignore the fact that the scientific method, which is now in use in fields of human reactions and relationships as well as in abstract and physical fields, is a different way of discovering truth from that of relying on biblical authority; and it is also useless to ignore the lesson of history that the reiterated proclamation of the most profound general principles has little effect if it is not accompanied by responsible and realistic explanation of those principles in contemporary life. Christendom for eighteen hundred years accepted an acquisitive society as the natural order, while it read daily and weekly the most magnificent condemnation of it from the prophets, and the most elaborate alternative to it in the Law.

Our fourth problem is that we are confronted to-day with the challenge of a non-acquistive society which could obviously be far nearer to the principles of both the Law and the Gospel than our own; but which has been achieved in Russia, entirely without the assistance of the Churches, by economists, sociologists and politicians. And we have to make a categoric decision on which side we shall stand in relation to our own future. I am by no means

one of those who see in the Soviet Union an immaculate conception, immaculately realized. But I have no doubt whatever that the acceptance or rejection of the idea of a non-acquisitive society is decisive for the future of the Church. I am not proposing that the Church should immediately become a political party. The questions at issue are far more searching than simply the ownership of property. We have ourselves been forced more and more away from the doctrines of *laisser faire*, and from the idea that you cannot make men good by Act of Parliament; but we can find no clear and stable relationship between Church and State in our present society. In a non-acquisitive society there can be no clear dividing line between material and spiritual issues, for such a society is founded on a conception of the good life which embraces both for all its citizens. Either Christianity becomes a superfluous luxury for those religiously inclined, or its place is right at the heart of such a society, and involves the examination of a whole new gamut of intimate relationships, relationships which to be effective must then be expressed in the local life of the churches.

IV.

I am sure that this question of the local churches is of capital importance, but I realize also that it is of immense difficulty. It is pathetic to listen to the average clerical meeting discussing 'what our men and women will want when they get home.' The truth is that eighty or ninety per cent. of them will neither expect nor want anything from the churches, and that a considerable proportion of the remainder do not expect to get what they do want. To-day I believe that there are almost as many listeners to the religious broadcasts of the B.B.C. who do not 'go to church' as there are attendants at the worship of all denominations. Such a situation is both deplorable and encouraging. It shows at least that there is available a certain reservoir of membership which might be attracted, or, to put it more profoundly, that there are many who desire to live their lives in some relationship with God and His purposes, apart from those who find their needs already met by our present ecclesiastical institutions.

Another encouraging factor is that there are many, outside the churches and who would not call themselves Christians at all, who are saying with ever increasing insistence that ordinary men need some kind of 'religion'—they are vague as to what they mean by the term—if they are to have both the moral courage and the inner stability needed to surmount successfully the tremendous obstacles and difficulties involved in a planned and ordered transition to a new society and a new way of living.

But if it is right to point to these elements in the situation which give encouragement, it is also needful to insist that the

Church as it stands cannot satisfy the demands of this generation. It is foolish idealism to say, as I have heard it said, that, after all, as people are expecting a religious revival, there is no need to change; and to expect that men and women will return to the present worship of the Church, or to such modifications of it as are offered, for example, in the Revised Prayer Book of 1928. The churches are there, did the people want them. They are not something unknown and untried. Far from it. They are known and they have been found wanting. But if the churches have been found wanting, it does not mean that men have found co-operation with God also to be uninteresting and unreal. And it is that which we have to discover new means to offer them.

I am not so foolish as to think that what I am pleading for can be supplied by a couple of week-end conferences and a few well-drafted memoranda. It took several centuries of continual controversy for the Catholic faith to assume the form with which we are still familiar. And the task to which we must sooner or later set our hands is no less important than that of our spiritual forefathers. It is, in fact, the same task; to find ways of expressing in contemporary language and ideas the great truths which had become real in their own lives. They are the same truths; but the language and the ideas have changed.

If at one extreme I am not asking for week-end conferences, at the other I am not asking for a schism. I would say frankly that there are evils worse than schism; but, in any case, the moment has not yet arrived in which such an issue has to be faced. I know that the vows which were taken by those of us who are ordained are, in themselves, singularly static, and that almost any advocacy of change might be deemed to be ruled out, or to involve an immediate resignation of our orders. But the overriding condition is to be found in the Ordination Service itself, in the charge of the bishop to the deacons called to the priesthood:

> 'Have in remembrance, into how high a dignity, and to how weighty an office and charge ye are called: that is to say, to be messengers, watchmen and stewards of the Lord; to teach and premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for his children who are in the midst of this naughty world.'

It is only because deep changes are necessary to enable us loyally to carry out this supreme task that they become justified.

These changes must be the result of corporate action, and many of them will need corporate experiment: some of them will concern Anglicans only, for many of them post-Reformation divisions will be irrelevant. I know from letters which I receive that there are many clergy and laity scattered through the country who are waiting for a lead. I have said that I believe only a false dawn can come from those who are not really 'liberals.'

ONE OF 'THE SEVEN AGAINST CHRIST'

HENRY BRISTOW WILSON, 1803—1888

IT is no new observation that there is something strangely arbitrary about the judgment of posterity which preserves the remembrance of a few from among the great and good in every age, whilst the very names of others, no less deserving, are abandoned to oblivion. The debt of mankind to its unknown and forgotten benefactors is no small one—to those who merited something better and yet 'are become as though they had never been born'; and the ungraciousness of their fate is hardly mitigated by the fact that their influence lives on unrelated to themselves; that what they sowed in tears, others reap in careless and unheeding joy.

Henry Bristow Wilson is to-day no longer remembered. His *Bampton Lectures*, at one time the subject of some controversy, are rarely seen and never referred to. The once famous *Essays and Reviews* of 1860 are not entirely forgotten, but few if any recall that Henry Bristow Wilson was the moving spirit behind their publication. Yet he was one of the greatest and most characteristic theologians of the nineteenth century and he deserves to be remembered at least by those in sympathy with the Broad Church movement, for he was a champion of the Broad Church theology in his day.

His father, the Rev. Harry Bristow Wilson, D.D., was rector of S. Mary Aldermary. The boy was born in 1803 and educated at the Merchant Taylors' School, where his father was for some time a master, and at St. John's College, Oxford. There he graduated B.A. in 1825 and was elected to a fellowship in the same year, a position which he retained for a quarter of a century.

The period of his fellowship at St. John's covered the whole of the rise and development of the Tractarian Movement as well as the years that followed Newman's secession to Rome.

When in 1841 the notorious *Tract XC* appeared, Wilson was one of the 'Four Oxford Tutors' who drew up a celebrated protest against it. All four were distinguished men in the University. Wilson himself at this time held the Rawlinsonian Professorship of Anglo-Saxon. The other three were T. T. Churton, Fellow and afterwards Vice-Principal of Brasenose College (the tutor of F. W. Robertson); John Griffiths, sub-Warden (later Warden) of Wadham, and A. C. Tait, Fellow of Balliol, who in the following year was to succeed Dr. Arnold at Rugby, and later

to become successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury.

> 'The "Tract,"' they said, 'appears to us to have a tendency to mitigate beyond what charity requires and to the prejudice of the pure truth of the Gospel, the very serious differences which separate the Church of Rome from our own.'

Were its author's principles admitted, there would be no reason why

> 'the most plainly erroneous doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome might not be inculcated in the lecture-rooms of the University and from the pulpits of our churches.'

This document marked the outburst of a great controversy which compelled Newman to acknowledge that he was himself the author of the offending Tract and led him to terminate the series.

Nine years later, in 1850, having served his college and university for five-and-twenty years, Wilson left Oxford for the college living of Great Staughton in Huntingdonshire. There during the first year of his incumbency he prepared his *Bampton Lectures* which were delivered in the year following before increasingly large congregations in the University Church. They were published under the title, *The Communion of Saints, an Attempt to Illustrate the True Principles of Christian Union.*

The lecturer began by explaining the reasons which led to his choice of subject:

> 'When we regard, especially, the character of universality which now belongs for the first time in the world's history, to many human relations; the diffusion of knowledge, in large communities, both widely and incompletely; the development of the powers of man, without, as some may apprehend, a proportionate addition of moral safeguards and restraints; we are led to inquire with some anxiety, how far that religion which we believe to be itself designed for universality, is found to be actually capable of coupling itself with such an altered system, and of acting upon humanity under conditions wherein it has never before found itself' (p. 2).

With such reflections in mind, Wilson examined that clause in the Apostles' Creed which affirms our belief in the Communion of Saints. It seems, he says,

> 'to admit of an application, and to contain the germ of it, which may be expanded into a practical principal of great importance, towards the action of Christianity upon the world' (p. 5 f).

He goes on to express the hope that the Church of England will

> 'renew some friendly intercourse with such portions of Christendom as will admit it; and that we shall not suffer ourselves to despise some, because they are less learned, or others because we presume them to be less perfectly constituted than ourselves' (p. 10).

Wilson recalls that any interpretation he places upon this

lause of the Creed must, in accordance with the Eighth Article f Religion, be agreeable to Scripture. But how is Scripture tself to be understood and interpreted? He replies:

> 'In appealing then to Scripture sense, I mean . . . the sense of Scripture as it *shall be* interpreted under the best lights of the present and future times' (p. 28).

He then proceeds to consider what those bonds of union are hereby Christian believers are bound together in the Communion f Saints, what, that is to say, are 'the true principles of Christian nion.'

In the course of the Lectures, several possible principles are eviewed in turn — the objective principle (as Wilson calls it), hristianity regarded as a dogmatic system; the subjective prinple, justification by faith; uniformity of worship. All these are ejected, for they narrow

> 'by successive limitations, the universal inheritance of mankind; entangling men again in a yoke of bondage, forging link after link, first upon the understanding, secondly upon the heart, thirdly upon the sense and taste, to fetter the liberty, wherewith Christ has made us free' (p. 109).

Sacramental grace is considered in the next lecture. This, ays Wilson,

> 'can become a binding influence in the communion of saints, so far as the relative character of Christians, one towards another, is thereby quickened and brought out' (p. 139).

But though it may subserve the looked-for principle, sacramental grace is not that principle itself. That principle, we at ength discover, is nothing else than self-sacrifice for the sake of thers. This is the true *imitatio Christi*.

> 'It is the most vital principle capable of transmission from Him through the Spirit, whereby the society of His saints is perpetuated and enlarged; and they, past, present and to come, linked together in one communion and fellowship' (p. 179).

Thus every Christian may become an apostle, for the test of is apostleship 'consists herein, that in order to act upon others or their good, he makes some sacrifice of self, if it be only in a ow degree' (p. 195). When the character of apostleship is thus xtended to the whole congregation, 'questions concerning miniserial succession fall back of themselves into a secondary importnce' (p. 194). There remains, however, a place for an organized inistry whose members 'should be elect from among the elect' p. 205).

Such a moral union, the lecturer believed, would be possible cross very wide separation of creed, order and worship.

> 'Above all,' he says, 'let not Christian ministers be the means of perpetuating divisions in the Christian name, when their people would gladly be at one' (p. 247).

Nevertheless, although the true unity is a moral one, it must be founded upon some faith common to all Christian people. This is 'a fixed faith in the supremacy and victory of good over evil. This faith has never been wanting to the true Christian; nor in degree to the true believer from the earliest time' (p. 279).

As the *Bampton Lectures* draw to their close, Wilson rises to a fine height of eloquence. The Christian pilgrims, he says, may reach the promised land by many devious routes.

> 'Like travellers across a mountain region to a distant city, some have taken as their guides those who seemed authorized to the office, or who set their own claims the highest; some have surrendered themselves to those whom accident first threw before them: some to the most clamorous and boastful; some to those who promised the smoothest and easiest way; others have yielded to the temptation of being conducted by passes known only to a few. But when once the journey is engaged in, it is for the most part too late to re-examine the credentials and qualifications of their guides, or to endeavour to correct an erroneous selection and choice: in the main, the reaching of their final resting place will depend on each one's constancy and perseverance; few will be led so far astray that their own energy and sense will not enable them to recover the true path: none will be so well guided that they can delay without risk or indulge themselves in seductive halting places. At last, as they approach the city of their rest, the tracks which seemed so devious and wide asunder are seen to converge, and the wayfarers, emerging from their toils, meet one another, not without surprise, which is soon swallowed up in cordial greetings, at the table of their common Lord' (p. 276 f).

Though Wilson's *Bampton Lectures* never, perhaps, obtained the recognition they deserved, they provoked a certain amount of controversy at the time of their delivery.

An article in the *Record*, for example, pronounced them 'semi-atheistical.' The writer demanded that Oxford should publicly repudiate the sentiments they contained, and that henceforth the University pulpit should be closed to Mr. Wilson. Otherwise 'she would stand before the world as the abettor and advocate of corrupt doctrine,' etc., etc.

Early in 1860, *Essays and Reviews* made its appearance. The idea of producing this volume was Wilson's own, but he had an enthusiastic supporter in Benjamin Jowett. Plans were already being made for it in 1858. Stanley was invited to contribute, but declined to do so. Jowett, however, managed to secure a university sermon by Dr. Frederick Temple. This appeared, evidently in an expanded form, under the title 'The Education of the World.' As it had aroused no suspicion of heresy when preached, it was probably hoped that it would provide an auspicious opening to the book, and it stood first among the essays. The others who contributed, besides Wilson and Jowett, were Rowland Williams, D.D., Vice-Principal of Lampeter; Baden Powell, F.R.S.

father of the late Chief Scout); C. W. Goodwin, the only lay contributor, and Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College.

The general aim of the venture was explained by Jowett thus:

> 'We are determined,' he wrote, 'not to submit to this abominable state of terrorism, which prevents the statement of the plainest facts, and makes true theology or theological education impossible.'[1]

At first *Essays and Reviews*[2] was the subject of but little controversy. After some months a storm of protest broke in good earnest and the seven essayists were assailed in ecclesiastical circles as 'the Seven against Christ.' Wilson and his friend Williams, whose subject had been Biblical Criticism, were prosecuted for heresy. Jowett, who had written on 'The Interpretation of Scripture,' narrowly escaped a similar charge in the Vice-Chancellor's court. Baden Powell would almost certainly have been called to account for his views on miracle, had he not died in the meantime, and, as it was piously expressed, 'been summoned before a higher tribunal.' Goodwin, whose essay was designed to shew the impossibility of reconciling the Mosaic Cosmogony with modern science, although not in Holy Orders, felt obliged to resign his Fellowship at Christ's College, Cambridge, so loud and threatening was the general outcry. Though no definite charges were brought against Temple and Mark Pattison, they were regarded with suspicion and disfavour for having appeared in such doubtful company.

The subject of Wilson's own essay was 'The National Church.' Wilson saw with concern that the Church was becoming less and less influential in the life of the Nation. The chief reason for this was, he felt, the Church's failure to relate its theology to the development of knowledge in general. It is this development, he says, which suggests

> 'questions to those who on Sundays hear the reading and exposition of the Scriptures as they were expounded to our forefathers, and on Monday peruse the news of a world of which our forefathers little dreamed' (*Essays and Reviews*, pp. 152-3).

Accordingly, Wilson pleads for the acceptance of an enlightened view of the Bible, and sufficient clerical freedom. For himself, he frankly admits that the Old Testament is not all of equal value, and even within the Gospel narratives he is prepared to allow a symbolic element.

> 'It need not trouble us,' he says, 'if, in consistency, we should have to suppose both an ideal origin and to apply an ideal meaning to the birth in the city of David, and to other circumstances of the infancy' (p. 203).

[1] Abbott and Campbell, *Life and Letters of Jowett*, I, p. 275.

[2] For some account of *Essays and Reviews*, see the concluding chapter of F. Storr's 'Development of Anglican Theology in the Nineteenth Century.'

Wilson was content to retain the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, but would have liked to see clerical subscription to them abolished.[3] The clergy would then simply be forbidden to teach what is contrary to them. In this way, he thought, candidates for the ministry might be recruited from a much larger section of the nation.

That a national Church is 'necessary to the completion of a national life,' Wilson was firmly convinced.

> 'If a nation is really worthy of the name, conscious of its own corporate life, it will develop itself on one side into a Church, wherein its citizens may grow up and be perfected in their spiritual nature' (p. 194).

Such a Church as this he realized was no more than an ideal. He saw only too plainly how few in this life 'grow up and are perfected in their spiritual nature.'

Nevertheless, his closing words are words of hope. They have often been quoted; they are worth quoting again.

> 'The Roman Church has imagined a *limbus infantium*; we must rather entertain a hope that there shall be found, after the great adjudication, receptacles suitable for those who shall be infants, not as to years of terrestrial life, but as to spiritual development — nurseries as it were and seed grounds, where the undeveloped may grow up under new conditions, the stunted may become strong, and the perverted be restored. And when the Christian Church, in all its branches, shall have fulfilled its sublunary office, and its Founder shall have surrendered His kingdom to the Great Father — all, both small and great, shall find a refuge in the bosom of the Universal Parent, to repose, or be quickened into higher life, in the ages to come, according to His will' (p. 206).

Wilson, as we have already mentioned, together with Dr. Williams, was prosecuted for heresy in the Court of Arches. His accuser was a certain Mr. Fendall, rector of Harlton, in the same diocese as Great Staughton. Though acquitted on most of the charges brought against them, both clerics were found guilty on others, and each was sentenced to a year's suspension of office. Both appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, where their sentences were eventually reversed with costs.[4] But the protracted litigation told severely upon Wilson's health, and he never recovered from the strain.

One of the charges brought against Wilson was that he had denied the eternal punishment of the wicked, the basis of the accusation being the passage from his essay quoted above. This was allowed in the Court of Arches, but the Privy Council ruled

[3] The Amended Subscription Act of 1865, with its large concessions of theological freedom for the clergy, must have gone far to satisfy Wilson's demand.

[4] Proceedings were begun in the Court of Arches in the autumn of 1861. The reversal of sentence by the Privy Council did not take place until February 8th, 1864.

that it is not penal in a clergyman to express the hope that even the ultimate pardon of the wicked who are condemned in the Day of Judgment may be consistent with the will of God.'

Thus it was Henry Bristow Wilson, and neither F. D. Maurice nor Dean Farrar, who gained for the English clergyman the right to preach 'Eternal Hope.' It is indeed no exaggeration to say Wilson 'did more by his individual efforts towards enlarging the boundaries of free inquiry within the Church of England than any other single man,'[5] and the sufferings which they cost him add lustre to the victories he won.

In spite of his impaired health and the anxieties which *Essays and Reviews* had occasioned him, Wilson was soon planning a second volume under the same title. Once again he had the warm support of Jowett. In a letter written to Prof. Edward Caird, inviting him to contribute,[6] Dr. Jowett explained the reasons why they were embarking on this second venture:

> 'I think it is a duty to do what I can to meet the low superstition and low materialism of the day. In another ten years half the English clergy will be given up to fetish priest-worship of the Sacrament . . . But it is plainly our duty to see what we can do towards meeting this . . . We propose to be careful not to get entangled with the law. I have great confidence in Wilson's ability and high principle . . . We feel that it is a very serious undertaking and great responsibility, but are determined *with God* to go on. . . .'

The volume promised to be of great interest. Caird agreed to write on Morality, Religion, Theology; Prof. Lewis Campbell on the Revision of the English New Testament. Jowett and Wilson were each to contribute two essays, Jowett on the Religions of the World and the Reign of Law; Wilson on the Principles of the Reformation and the Sacramentarian Theory.[7]

Unhappily the volume came to nothing. In 1870, a few months before the work was to have been published, Wilson's health was finally destroyed by a paralytic stroke. Though he continued to live for another eighteen years, his active life now terminated, and one can imagine only too well the weariness which this long period of prostration must have caused to an intellect so acute and vigorous. His death took place in his eighty-sixth year, during the month of August, 1888.

Wilson, it has been rightly said,[8] stood for two great principles: (1) the universality of law in the natural and spiritual worlds;

[5] Abbott and Campbell, *Op. cit.*, p. 301.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 441.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 405.

[8] By the Rev. R. B. Kennard, in his funeral oration.

(2) Christianity as the true Revelation of God and the supreme Religion of man. He was content to be called a Protestant, but he had a deep understanding of the meaning of that word.

> 'Protestants abandon Protestantism,' he says,[9] 'when they contentedly rest in the particular applications which the Reformers made of their Protestant principles . . . for the essence or principle of Protestantism [consists] in the vindication of the national and Christian freedom of Churches and individuals against the assumptions of Rome to impose doctrine.'

His strong belief in the universality of Law was no doubt partly the reason for Wilson's steady rejection of Roman and Tractarian sacramental doctrine. He repudiated whatever seemed to him occult and magical; but none could have had a more ready appreciation of the Christian sacraments than he. In this matter he was influenced by Zwingli, to whom he refers in his *Bampton Lectures*:[10]

> 'Zwingli saw that the effect to be produced by the sacraments on the moral being must be produced according to the laws of that being; he saw that the sacraments were most wisely adapted, by their form and administration, to act through the senses and other faculties upon the moral being; he felt no necessity for any more recondite mode of their operation' (*Communion of Saints*, p. 135).

Moreover, Wilson believed that this was the teaching of St. Paul, as well:

> 'And thus St. Paul, for a moral purpose, presents to the imagination of the Romans the recollection of their baptism, that it may produce its hortative effect: "Therefore are we buried with him by baptism unto death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also might walk in newness of life" (*Rom.* vi, 4). And not only is the effect, which the Apostle teaches us to look for in the sacraments, a moral and personal one, the forms of the sacrament are themselves suggestive of, and therefore become signs of effectual grace, and of the grace of charity above all others. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jew or Gentile, whether we be bond or free" (I *Cor.* xii, 13); and "For we, being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread"' (I *Cor.* x, 17) (pp. 138-9).

Wilson approved of Infant Baptism, not because at its administration any psychical change is there and then wrought,

> 'but as most consistent with the institution of Christ; as signing and sealing to the receiver an interest in the redemption and remission of sins . . . The infant may indeed be placed in a new condition well worthy of being called a new birth, but in comparison of what it may become, it is an imperfect and negative condition, it is rather a possibility than a reality, a material rather than a work or product' (pp. 142-3).

[9] In a sermon quoted by Mr. Kennard.

[10] *cf.* Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, p. 97.

Convinced as he was of the need for Christian unity and Christian comprehensiveness, Wilson was yet aware that this inevitably brought within the Church many who were Christians in little except name, who tended to impede the Church's action upon secular society. The remedy which he suggests for this is that those only should be confirmed of whom the community is satisfied that their character as disciples is completely or sufficiently formed.

As vicar of Great Staughton, Wilson, so long as he retained his health, was an active parish priest, and the village church was restored during his incumbency.

Protestant and Broad Churchman, diligent alike as a college don and country vicar, perhaps Wilson is best described as a Rationalist, in the true sense of that word. Our concluding extract is from an article which he contributed to the *Oxford Essays for 1857*. It is typical of those characteristics which this paper has attempted to illustrate.

> 'Mystic faith is not the proper judge of Reason, but Reason of Faith; and if reason hitherto gives doubtful and hesitating answers to our interrogatories, it is because we interrogate her, severally, in the caves hewn out by our fathers in the hillside during the stone age; and echoes come back to us for answer, in the syllables of our own questions. If Reason disappoints, mystic faith misleads or may mislead. Reason openly questioned can acknowledge its errors, defects in evidence and shortcomings in its own power; faith, more presumptuous, cannot re-examine deductions or foundations, for its only foundation as it persuades itself, is the Rock and Fount of all Truth . . . It is commonly laid down that Reason is no proper judge of divine things . . . a higher faculty alone can deal with things spiritual and divine. But the division of the object matter itself is arbitrary. For that is divine wherein we live and move and have our being in our daily, transitory life.'

But however Wilson may best be described, there can be no doubt as to the elevation of his character and ideals. Whatever else he may have been, he was 'a brave and noble-hearted Christian man, a faithful servant and devoted minister of Jesus Christ.'[11]

D. L. Scott.

[11] Mr. Kennard's description, in his funeral sermon.

QUENCHING THE SPIRIT

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc., author of *No Casual Creed*, etc.

THE recent eclipse of Liberalism is a phenomenon which we have to explain as best we may. No doubt 'the swing of the pendulum' accounts for a good deal; there are fashions in ideas as there are in clothes. Liberalism became *démodé* and therefore as ridiculous as a last season's hat. Persons who wished to be up-to-date must repudiate it.

An essential part of Liberalism was freedom of thought. That truth is strong enough to prevail if there is a free field and no favour; that a dogmatic attitude is unworthy of a civilized man; that all claims to infallibility must be taken with a grain of salt; such were some of its principles. During the nineteenth century —a period our latter-day saints ridicule through subconscious envy—all this and a great deal more went without saying. It was an atmosphere which people breathed, the medium in which their ideas moved.

We have changed all that. It may have been the 1914-18 War, or the New Psychology, or simply the 'swing of the pendulum,' but during that dim period between the wars, Liberalism was quietly dethroned. Though perhaps *quietly* is not the word to describe the process on the Continent of Europe. The hard Dogmatism which supervened, suppressing the old freedom of thought, was politico-economic in character, and though it wore two masks, was at bottom one.

> 'It might be disputed,' writes Professor Arnold Toynbee, 'whether Fascism and Communism were entitled to represent themselves as being genuine alternatives to one another. . . . Fascism prescribed the worship of organized human power in the shape of a tribe with some local tang of "blood and soil"; Communism prescribed the worship of the same idea in the oecumenical form of a "Humanity" with a capital "H." This difference was superficial.'[1]

The two régimes unmistakably more and more 'approximated to one standard pattern.'

This politico-economic dogmatism, however, whether of the Fascist-Nazi or of the Communist brand has already fallen into disrepute. The Fascist régime in Italy, after a brief period of 'glory,' overplayed its hand, and ended in disillusionment and misery. The Nazi dispensation, after just missing the glittering

[1] *Survey of International Affairs, 1936*, p. 29.

prizes of world conquest,[2] seems destined to a like ignoble end. As for dogmatic Communism, with the liquidation of the last of the Bolshevik Old Guard in 1938, and with the subsequent dissolution of the Fourth International, it belongs now to the limbo of lost causes. Few can look for its resurrection.

But while these dogmatisms flourished, there is no denying that they struck terror into the hearts of many idealists whose Liberalism was of the amiable and gentle, rather than of the 'tough' variety — the kind of people who are not really Liberals at all, since 'when affliction or persecution ariseth for the Word's sake, immediately they are offended.' In particular among the professional religionists there were many half-hearted Liberals (and of course many who were anti-liberal, and hardly knew what the word meant), who were convinced that the only way to deal with these hateful new dogmatisms was to confront them with an old dogmatism. It seemed the natural course, to treat one poison with a counter-poison.

So natural it seemed that it occurred to Catholics and Protestants simultaneously. The former demanded a return to the thirteenth, the latter to the sixteenth, century, *i.e.* to Aquinas or to Calvin. Neo-Thomism and Neo-Calvinism were offered as panaceas for the salvation of a distracted world. Many of our intellectuals, dismayed by times so out of joint, also blew the retreat. Once more, 'those in front cried, "Back!"' It was a failure of nerve.

As in the case of the corresponding politico-economic dogmatisms, the Catholic and Protestant propaganda 'approximated to one standard pattern.' The dogma stressed by both alike was that of Original Sin, and this based, not upon any scientific estimate of human nature, but simply upon traditional authority, primarily that of St. Augustine. Humanism, Liberalism, Pelagianism, were all included under a common anathema. These tirades against 'modernity' were as innocent of any comprehensive knowledge of history as of any accurate knowledge of science. In point of fact they were as much a pathological symptom as the political dogmatisms they were designed to confute. But their effect, if any, is likely to be transient, for 'Can Satan cast out Satan?' One calls both classes of dogmatism — the politico-economic and the pseudo-theological — pathological because they could hardly have emerged had not European civilization lost faith in itself, *i.e.* the will to live and the will to conquer. European civilization *is* the Renaissance, and if you repudiate that you

[2] But for the defection of Liberalism in the Western democracies, this peril to civilization would never have matured. The truth is that our ills may be traced to the collapse of Liberalism, or rather, to its betrayal by inertia, cowardice and self-interested pacifiism.

repudiate Europe, and go back behind Greece to Asia or Egypt, to the dark territories unlit by reason. And, 'If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!' But some, as we are told, 'prefer darkness to the light.' Dim light is attractive in some ways; there all things look alike, and the blind are not so handicapped.

> 'Let us be quite clear what this challenge really means,' writes Dr. A. D. Lindsay. 'It does not just mean that Protestantism was a mistake—though it does mean that; or just that modern science has been such a misfortune that we should give it up—though it does mean that. It means that what is sometimes called Anglo-Saxon civilization is a mistake; . . . that, in short, the causes we profess to defend in this war had better not be defended.
>
> '. . . I do not deny—who could?—that modern Western civilization is in sore straits. We clearly must consider hard where we have failed and what has gone wrong, and be ready to give reasons for the faith that is in us. But it is one thing to do that, and to conclude that we have failed because we have not been faithful to the vision given to us in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; we have not kept our principles alive to meet the new problems with which our very success has confronted us. It is quite another to say in disillusion and weariness that the whole adventure was wrong.'[3]

Yet this is just what our prophets of the twilight are saying with perverse satisfaction. Their message is that Liberalism has failed, and that it has failed because of its lack of dogmatism. Return, therefore, to the dogmatism of the past, and here you will find the only effective weapon to demolish the barbarous politico-economic dogmatisms of the twentieth century.

As a matter of fact, these twentieth-century dogmatisms are already wilting, as has been observed above; thus there is the less need to resuscitate old dogmatisms to exorcise them. And as the resuscitation of old dogmatisms is itself a product of the causes which produce those they oppose, there is little likelihood that this will prove an effective antidote. Both phenomena are really products of a certain unsettlement, a sense of being adrift, a loss of aim, and a general shaking of values.

Such a condition is obviously not a healthy one. But politico-economic dogmatisms have not proved an effective cure; on the contrary, they have aggravated the disease. Is it likely that these alternative dogmatisms of the thirteenth or sixteenth centuries will prove more effective? Does history teach that they were certain cures in their own day? Were they able to prevent, did they not rather cause, the disastrous horrors of the Thirty Years War? Was not the result eventually that in the eighteenth century men said, 'A plague on both your houses,' and replaced dogmatism by Reason, which gave Europe a chance to become civilized once more? We need not fear that this latest revival of religious dogmatism will lead to barbarism and bloodshed, as the politico-

[3] *Religion, Science and Society in the Modern World*, p. 9.

economic dogmatisms have done, because it can never acquire enough vitality to work so much mischief.

Then where is the cure to be found? How are faith and belief to be restored, without which life and health are impossible? These things cannot be restored by a revival of dogmatism, which is in reality the petrefaction of belief, the preservation in spirits of the corpse of faith.

But it is of no use to imagine that Liberalism — or any other attitude — will prevail unless it has a philosophy, a principle of existence by which it lives. Has Liberalism such a philosophy? If it has not, it will inevitably go down before dogmatism, which *has* a philosophy, one that is simple, attractive—and false, namely, that infallible truth is revealed to man, whether through Hitler, Marx, or the Pope.

Its enemies (for there is much able propaganda against Liberalism) declare that Liberalism *has* its philosophy, a bad one, namely, scepticism and 'relativism.' That is to say, that there is no such thing as truth, only opinion; no such thing as right, only expediency and custom. Also they declare that Liberalism is morally enervating as well as intellectually vague:

> 'How could Mankind be expected to live for ever on such uninspiring watchwords as "*Pas trop de zèle*," "Above all, no enthusiasm," and "Enlightened self-interest"?'[4]

As a matter of fact, distrust of dogmatism has no logical connection whatever with disbelief in objective truth, whether intellectual or moral. Dogma may quite reasonably be regarded as the enemy of such truth, and for two reasons. First, because it is an illegitimate attempt to represent as, and render, permanent what is in fact only preliminary and partial (since we know only 'in part'). Second, because it seeks to import definiteness and certainty into areas where such things cannot, through the nature of the case, exist. To take these two fallacies of dogmatism in turn.

(1) Truth may be defined as our human grasp of reality. Whatever of reality our faculties can lay hold of is truth. It is clear that these faculties of ours can never grasp the whole of reality, since we are finite, and it infinite; the part can never comprehend the whole. But the fragment of reality which we can and do grasp is genuine, and thus our truth is objective, and not matter of opinion.[5] But it is clear that it is both theoretically and

[4] Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[5] To quote the Master of Balliol again: 'I am convinced that the beginning of the modern adventure in both science and religion was the revival of the essentially Christian conception of the infinity of God and the consequent realization that God had given man an infinite task in understanding and doing His will and knowing His world. This meant the giving up of all formulations of the will of God which claimed to be final and all intellectual constructions into which new discoveries had to be fitted. It meant a belief in experiment and diversity' (*op. cit.*, p. 10).

practically possible for mankind to learn, by exploration and experiment, more and more of reality. In the sphere of the natural sciences, this is what mankind has actually been doing for the last three or four centuries. And if this is so, clearly dogmatism (*i.e.* the insistence that truth is a closed system, that the area of reality already grasped cannot be expanded or the frontiers of our knowledge pushed back) is an illegitimate stultification of human effort. And, historically, whenever dogmatism has been dominant, human efforts for further knowledge have in actual fact been stultified. Dogmatism is therefore, as F. H. Bradley maintained it to be in both of its most common forms, *i.e.* dogmatic secularism and dogmatic 'orthodoxy,' 'the mutilation of our nature.'[6]

(2) Then there is a second fallacy of dogmatism, namely its insistence upon importing certainty into spheres where it is not only impossible of attainment but inappropriate and unnecessary. The dogmatist, though he will occasionally belittle the achievements of science, yet envies the certainty of its results. This certainty of scientific knowledge, compared with some other types of knowledge, is attributable to two causes. (*a*) It is in part the product of the method of abstraction, whereby whatever is 'irreducible to terms of regular uniform 'law,' or whatever is individual and unique, can be removed or 'strained out,' much as one removes seeds in the preparation of blackberry jelly. The certainty is present in the results because possible sources of uncertainty are ruled out in the subject-matter. (*b*) But this certainty is also the product of another cause. Scientific knowledge is certain because it can generally be attested by an appeal to the senses, for it is based on data supplied by the senses.[7] And the five senses themselves (this is the important point) are *practically uniform in all normal human beings*, which makes the appeal to the senses universally convincing, so far as it goes. It is otherwise in the aesthetic and moral spheres. Here likewise the appeal is to the

[6] Bradley pleads that even on the view that the study of metaphysics 'can produce no positive results,' it should still be pursued. 'There is, so far as I can see, no other certain way of protecting ourselves against dogmatic superstition. Our orthodox theology on the one side, and our common-place materialism on the other side (it is natural to take these as prominent instances), vanish like ghosts before the daylight of free sceptical inquiry. I do not mean, of course, to condemn wholly either of these beliefs; but I am sure that either, when taken seriously, is the mutilation of our nature' (*Appearance and Reality*, p. 5).

[7] It may be said that the heliocentric theory of Copernicus, Newton's theory of gravitation, and modern relativity theories contradict sense experience and are based rather upon mathematical reasoning. But the relativity theory was confirmed by a certain phenomena only visible at the time of a total eclipse of the sun, and on the Copernican theory eclipses can be more satisfactorily accounted for than by Ptolemaic theories. As a matter of fact the above theories only *appear* to deny the validity of sense experience.

senses—the aesthetic and moral senses—but human beings are so variously equipped with these that conviction can never be universal. Thus what seems good or beautiful to one may seem the opposite to his neighbour, though both alike are capable of seeing scarlet or green and distinguishing a high note from a low one.

In view of the above, both moral and aesthetic judgments have been accounted purely 'subjective'—that they are all matter of opinion or taste, and that all objective standards of the good and beautiful are unattainable. This is no place to embark upon an exhaustive discussion of such a subject, but it would seem that the ultimate appeal in these spheres is to the man who *knows*, *i.e.* to the person or group of persons equipped with the most sensitive aesthetic or moral perceptions, which are largely a matter of social tradition and personal character and development. In the religious or spiritual sphere the difficulty of establishing universal conviction is as great as or greater than in the aesthetic and ethical spheres.

It is only necessary to imagine a group of enthusiasts for some particular aesthetic judgments seeking to impose these dogmatically upon the world at large, to see how inappropriate such action would be. It would rightly be regarded as an attempt to import incontrovertible certainty into a sphere where such a thing from the nature of the case was neither possible nor desirable. Not desirable, because the rigidity involved in certainty would make all advances in aesthetic perception impossible. It would impose a veto upon all growth in aesthetic sensitiveness.

Yet this is exactly what happens, and is widely accepted as the natural thing to happen, in the spheres of ethics and religion. The dogmatist insists upon importing the same preciseness, definiteness, and incontrovertible certainty into these spheres as are appropriate only in the sphere of the Natural Sciences.

Thus the second fallacy of dogmatism is its attempted introduction of definiteness, preciseness, finality and incontrovertible certainty into those spheres of religion and ethics[8] where their existence is inappropriate and, in reality, impossible. Even in the scientific sphere where dogmatism might seem possible and appropriate, since everything in the last resort appears capable of definite proof, it is repudiated. An hypothesis is only retained so long as it accounts for the known facts more satisfactorily than any other. Thus it is perhaps no accident that the best energies of the race are going into Science rather than into Religion, to our grave detriment.

[8] That the infiltration of dogmatism into the aesthetic sphere has not been achieved, nor even attempted with any determination, affords an interesting contrast with dogmatism's successful aggressions on the ethical and religious fronts. Is this due to the fact that the vested interests of powerful institutions and corporations are not to the same extent involved?

It is interesting to speculate on the possible results of progressive scientific discovery accompanied by petrefaction in the spheres of philosophy, art and religion. It is conceivable that the State of the future might encourage scientific research as a means of increasing its repressive powers as well as its capacities for production; and simultaneously impose a rigid, dogmatic orthodoxy in the political and 'ideological' spheres. Modern developments in the arts and machinery of mass propaganda — the wireless, the cinema, the press, the psychology of advertising, etc.—have made the imposition of ideas a comparatively simple matter, and a minimum of persecution is required, though the technique of this, too, has been highly developed of recent years. It is only too possible for our modern mass industrial democracy to take this direction; and in this event all freedom of thought would be driven underground, and Liberalism hibernate in the catacombs. But even so the seed will germinate, and as the young tree may gradually crack the solid wall, so the dogmatic prison will be broken and the souls of men liberated.[9]

What is important to realize is that dogmatism in the political sphere can never be defeated by dogmatism in the theological sphere, though many people to-day appear to imagine so. The two are far more likely to join forces for the suppression of freedom of thought which is the enemy of both alike. Death and petrefaction in one sphere are not to be overcome by death and petrefaction in another. It is only life that can overcome death.[10]

[9] These reflections were suggested by a passage in a letter from the late Dr. Edwyn Bevan, printed by A. J. Toynbee in his *Study of History*, Vol. V, p. 9: 'I do not think the danger before us is anarchy, but despotism, the loss of spiritual freedom. . . . As an alternative to anarchy the World would welcome the despotic state. Then the world might enter upon a period of spiritual petrefaction, a terrible order which for the higher activities of the human spirit would be death. The petrefaction of the Roman Empire . . . would appear less rigid, because the ruling group would have much greater scientific means of power. . . .

It seems to me possible that in such a totalitarian state while philosophy and poetry would languish, scientific research might go on with continuous fresh discoveries. Greek science did not find the Ptolemaic realm an uncongenial environment, and I think, generally speaking, natural science may flourish under a despotism. It is to the interest of the ruling group to encourage what may increase their means of power.'

[10] A salutary antidote to the now fashionable denigration of humanity may be found at the close of Dr. Coulton's *Fourscore Years*:

> 'Common-sense suggested to me from the first that *homo sapiens* is, on the whole, an improving animal, and History has seemed to confirm the probability more and more. There is no horror even in 1942, so I believe, which cannot be outmatched from the records of distant centuries. Man is not a fallen angel; the facts concordant with saner faith tell us that we have struggled painfully upwards, and exhort us to struggle still.'

GOD'S FOREKNOWLEDGE AND MAN'S FREE WILL

By Professor Clement Rogers, author of *Baptism and Christian Archaeology*, etc.

'God therefore is a law both to himself, and to all other things besides. Nor is the freedom of the will of God any whit abated, let, or hindered, by means of this; because the imposition of this law upon himself is his own free and voluntary act.'

—Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book I, ch. ii, 1 and 6.

I HAVE been taken to task for saying in my little book on *Prediction* that:

'if we are puzzled to reconcile God's Omniscience with the Freedom of Man we may say—and it is sound Theology—that He does not know the future because it does not exist, and even God cannot know what does not exist. It is no derogation to His almighty power to say that He has Himself limited His power in giving man Free Will and, as it were, standing aside to give it free play. If this involves a limitation of His knowledge, as some think and some do not, it is a self-limitation which lies within His own power.'

I have been asked, 'Is not this against the teaching of the Church?' What I wrote was the result of much experience of being cross-questioned in Hyde Park and of general reading about Free Will and Fatalism. I had not then traced the history of the doctrine of God's Omnipotence and Omniscience in connexion with Freedom.

I.

The problem does not seem to have been given special consideration in Biblical times. Susanna (*v.* 42 = *Daniel* xiii, 42 Vulg.) prayed, 'O everlasting God, that knowest the secrets, that knowest all things before they be,' but she was not considering a problem of Theology when she had just been condemned to death. St. Paul is often quoted as saying in *Rom.* viii, 29, 'For whom he foreknew he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son'; but, as commentators point out, 'knew' means 'loved,' as when the Son of Man is spoken of as saying 'Depart from me, I never knew you,' or when St. John speaks of our being 'known of God.' In *Rom.* ix, 18, St. Paul seems to deny man's Free Will and to preach a doctrine of Pre-determinism when he says, 'So then he hath mercy on whom he will and whom he will he hardeneth,' but in neither case is he considering the problem of the reconciliation of God's Omniscience with the Freedom of Man.

So, as a rule, the question is shirked. Encyclopaedias talk vaguely about the Old Testament conception of God as all-

knowing and start by assuming that 'the future, therefore, must be open to His sight.' They fumble with the question and say, 'We are only talking about the Bible'; or write, 'In what way the thought of man's freedom to will was reconcileable with God's electing purpose, the writers of the Bible did not care to discuss. They felt, we may believe, instinctively, half consciously, that the problem was insoluble, and were content to accept the two beliefs which cannot logically be reconciled.' Or they allude to 'that harassing perplexity of foreknowledge and free will.' All of which is not very helpful. They remind us of the Oxford History lecturer who, it is reported, used to say, 'Let us look this difficulty in the face—and pass on.'

II.

The question was raised in the second century by Celsus at Alexandria in a form still commonly heard to-day. He declared that Christ's words about Judas were prophecies after the event. The only alternative, he said, was that God had made him a traitor. So the secularist heckler to-day says, 'If God knew from the beginning that Christ was to die upon the Cross, then Judas was not to blame for betraying Him. He couldn't help himself.' Origen declared that this was frivolous, but replied:

> 'Celsus imagines that an event, predicted through foreknowledge, comes to pass because it was predicted. But we do not grant this, maintaining that he who foretold it was not the cause of its happening because he foretold it would happen; but the future event itself, which would have taken place though not predicted, afforded the occasion to Him "who was endowed with foreknowledge" of foretelling the occurrence.'[1]

This is quite sound reasoning and it needed to be said. Knowing that a thing will happen and making it happen are two quite different things in the abstract.

But what he says is only relevant to abstract laws like those of mathematics and to physical laws deduced from mechanically determined results. It has a certain limited application in connexion with habit, where actions are for a time determined by previous actions, and man's free will is temporarily suspended, and character has been formed by previous acts of will so far as to determine the course of his action. As a general statement it is merely a falling back on the belief in a fixed future without any free will in man.

Origen himself seems to have felt this was inadequate and returned to the subject in his Commentary on *Genesis* i, 16. He is talking about the stars as God's creation and their alleged influence on man. His words exist in the Latin translation of Rufinus,

[1] *Contra Celsum*, Lib. II, cap. 20.

ut the original Greek is preserved in his *Philocalia* (cap. 23), as ell as by Eusebius in the sixth book of his *De Praeparatione vangelica*. Pagans frankly accepted the current astrology, and any Christians were troubled because it seemed to be taking way man's free will and, with it, all praise or blame for his ctions. Origen replies at length and sums up:

> 'And if we are bound to admit that the foreknowledge is not the cause of the occurrences (for though God knows that a man will sin, He does not put a finger on him when he does sin), we shall make a still stronger statement, nevertheless true, that the future event is the cause of God's peculiar knowledge concerning it. *For it does not happen because it is known; but it is known because it will happen;* and we must herein carefully distinguish.'

his, again, is perfectly sound, and elsewhere Origen sees the ecessity of insisting on the freedom of man's will and his moral esponsibility at all costs. His words seem to have been quoted gain and again by later writers, and the last sentence of the above assage became the stock text on the subject.

But he does not settle the difficulty. He is anxious to insist nat God is omnipotent and not subject to any power outside Himelf, but he does not really consider the question of omniscience n God and how it can be reconciled with man's freedom. Nor oes he take into account whether God can know future events hich do not yet exist, or whether, as Plato asserted, knowledge an only be of things that are. For in the Fifth Book of the *Republic* he had, long ago, shown Socrates telling Glaucon to nswer for the person who thinks he knows something when he eally only has an opinion about it, and asks:

> 'Does he know something or nothing? Do you reply on his behalf.'
> 'I will reply,' he said, 'that he knows something.'
> 'Is it something that is or is not?'
> 'That is. How could that which is not be known?'

nd concludes that

> 'We are sufficiently assured of this, then, even if we should examine it from every point of view, that that which entirely "is" is entirely knowable, and that which in no way "is" is in every way unknowable.'[2]

imilarly in the *Parmenides* he asks:

> 'Then, is each Form one of these thoughts and yet a thought of nothing?'
> 'No, that is impossible.'
> 'So it is a thought of something?'
> 'Yes.'
> 'Of something that is? or of something that is not?'
> 'Of something that is.'[3]

ut these, though relevant to our subject, are in relation to it mere *biter dicta*. Plato is thinking in the *Republic* about the difference

[2] *Republic*, V. 20, 476 E. [3] *Parmenides*, 132 B.

between knowledge, opinion, and ignorance in man, and in the *Parmenides* whether forms or ideas exist in thought only. There is no question raised about God and the world to come.

Origen seems to have been followed by Chrysostom, by Athanasius, and in the East generally, especially by Procopius of Gaza, as well as by Jerome. Augustine in his earlier days emphasized the freedom of man's will against Manichaean fatalism, but takes the opposite view about God's knowledge of the future.

> 'He knew beforehand,' he says, 'without any beginning, all things to come in time, and among them also both what we should ask of Him, and when; and to whom He would either listen or not listen, and on what subjects. And with respect to all His creatures, both spiritual and corporal, He does not know them because they are, but they are because He knows them.'[4]

He is anxious to assert God's power and the fact that He is in no way subservient to the stars, but he is not so much thinking of the question of Free Will or the Predestination implied in his words. Like Origen, he does not face the question of the possible limitation of God's knowledge.

III.

The first really to face it seems to have been Boethius. He begins to 'get warm' in the theological game of hide-and-seek. In his *De Consolatione Philosophiae* (Lib. V, Prosa vi, § 5) he declares that the difficulty is not solved by the above arguments, as some people seem to think, and repeats Origen's words which, it would appear, have become the stock quotation on the subject, though he does not mention his name.

The passage is quoted in a full treatment of the subject, as will be seen from the titles of the chapters which come before and after. Thus Bk. IV, Prosa 5: 'Man does not know the causes of the Divine Dispensation.' (6) 'On Providence and Fate,' a very different question. They are different things, but, though they are different, one depends on the other. (7) 'Fortune arises from God's reward in trying, punishing and curing and bringing them back to Himself.' That is, God works by eternal laws and principles. In Book V, Prosa i, he continues: 'As God foresees all there is no such thing as Chance.' There is cause and effect everywhere. Chance (*casus*) is Aristotle's '*Tyche*' (τύχη) what some to-day call Indeterminism or Freedom of Indifference and illustrate it by the Quantum Theory. Therefore God may hand over causation to us. (2) 'Man has Free Will.' (3) 'Divine Providence seems to rule out Man's Free Will.' A very difficult question, for if God foresees all and cannot err, that must happen which He foresees. For if He knows from eternity not only what man will do but purposes

[4] *De Trinitate*, Lib. XV, cap. 13.

and wills, there is no Free Will. Origen's words do not meet this difficulty. How can God be certain about uncertainties? Besides, this makes all reward and punishment inane. Then, as usual, he makes a little poem about it. Finally, he suggests a line of solution, but all that it leads him to is that a thing is only understood by our powers of understanding, and he falls back on human ignorance. (5) We must not deny God's foreknowledge because of the weakness of our faculties; and finally he (6) concludes that God's knowledge is not like our knowledge:

> 'For God's sight preventeth all that is to come and recalleth and draweth it to the presence of His own knowledge; neither doth He vary, as thou imaginest, now knowing one thing and now another, but in one instant without moving preventeth and comprehendeth thy mutations. . . . All which being so, the free will of mortal man remaineth unviolated, neither are the laws unjust which propose punishments and rewards to our wills, which are free from all necessity.'[5]

That is, he declares that words mean different things when applied to God and to men. He repeats the old but irrelevant argument of Origen and sets side by side two mutually contradictory opinions. He fails to consider the question whether future things not yet existing can be known since they are not part of all things, and settles the question by the verbal meaning of the word 'Omniscience' which he attributes to God instead of deducing its meaning from the study of what God is and does.

IV.

Aquinas was not the sort of man who would shirk inquiry on any question, nor would he ever pronounce an opinion without considering all that might be said against it and then answering it as well as he could.

In his *Summa* (Part I, Quaest. xiv, 'The Knowledge of (in) God,' Art. 8) he follows Augustine, who says that 'All creatures, spiritual and corporeal, are not known by God because they are, but they are because He knows them. He replies to the apparently opposite statement of Origen. In speaking of knowledge (apart from will) he points out that eternal knowledge of things does not make them eternal and that natural objects are prior to our knowledge of them but not prior to God Himself.

In Art. 9 he asks whether God has knowledge of non-existence and answers that 'God knows all things that in any way are.' It is possible that things that do not actually exist should in a certain sense exist. Whatever can be made, or thought of, by the creature, as also whatever He himself can do, all is known to God, although they do not actually exist. In this sense He has knowledge even

[5] Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*. Tr. 'I.T.' (1609); revised by H. F. Stewart; 'Loeb Library' (1918) pp. 409-10.

of non-existence. But Aquinas does not say that He knows whether they will exist or not, though he distinguishes between knowledge of vision and knowledge of simple intelligence, adding :

> 'What things exist potentially are true as potentialities and as such they are known by God';

that is, that God does not know the future where it is not fixed but only what may happen.

He goes on to declare that the Divine Will imposes necessity in some things but not in all, and in Quaest. 25, 'The Power of God,' considers the question of God's omnipotence, saying that it does not, of course, apply to impossible things, or to anything that involves a contradiction. He cannot make the past not the past, or make 2 + 2 not equal to 4, though he does not quote the modern catch as to whether He can make a weight too heavy for Himself to lift, or make a valley without two hills one on each side. It is better to say of such things that they cannot be done than that God is unable to do them.'

He deals more fully with the question of omnipotence in the *Contra Gentiles* (Lib. I, ch. xxv), but I cannot find from the very full index of the Venetian Edition of his works (1545) that he said any more about the limitations of His Omniscience, and of things which He cannot know, or rather 'which cannot be known.'

The chief next re-statement of the problem seems to have been made by Descartes. In his *Principles of Philosophy* (Part I, 40) he lays down that the Freedom of the Will is self-evident, that we likewise know certainly that everything is ordained of God, and in asking how this Freedom of the Will may be reconciled with Divine Predestination he says :

> 'Instead of this (trying to comprehend) pre-ordinance with the freedom of the Will (both at one time) we shall have no trouble if we recollect that our thoughts are finite and that the omnipotence of God, whereby He has not only known from all eternity that which is, or can be, but also willed and pre-ordained it, is infinite.'

Thus he, too, begs the question by first assuming that omnipotence does not include the power of leaving the future open and giving man Free Will. Then he puts two mutually contradictory statements side by side and holds on to both, implying, as Mansel did, that words have a different (and not merely a transcendent) meaning when applied to God from that which they have when applied to man, and falls back on the agnostic position of saying 'it's all a mystery.' No wonder Pascal found him '*inutile et uncertain*' (useless and uncertain).

But this still seems to be the general attitude of theologians to-day. The *Doctrinal Report*, admirable in its dealing with Free Will and Predestination, does not consider the question of God's Prescience. Writers in our commentaries and encyclopaedias refer to Origen, to Augustine, to Boethius (sometimes), to Aquinas

(or to parts of his writings) and leave it at that. They say that from the human point of view they cannot harmonize the two conceptions, how man can be free if God is almighty, saying that:

> 'He is so infinitely great that it is not possible for a man to conceive what He can accomplish. If that be the case, while it may be difficult to you from your limited human standpoint to harmonise the two conceptions of foreknowledge and Free Will, divine sovereignty and human responsibility, it does not follow from the divine standpoint.'

It was of a doctrine something like this, the teaching that words meant one thing in God and quite another thing in man, that J. S. Mill said:

> 'I will call no being good who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow creatures; and if such a being can sentence me to hell for not calling him so, to hell I will go.'[6]

V.

The first person to deal thoroughly with the question of Omniscience and Free Will seems to have been James Martineau when he wrote his *A Study of Religion* (Oxford, 2nd ed., 1887). In Book III, chap. ii, he deals with 'Determinism and Free Will,' in § 4 of which he writes on 'The Foreknowledge of Voluntary Action.' He begins by considering the Law of Averages from which Buckle in his *History of Civilization in England* (1857) had 'drawn such startling inferences' (Vol. II, p. 249), namely that, to put it briefly, the fact that the number of suicides keeps about the same from year to year proves that each individual who kills himself can't help doing so and that men have no Free Will, an argument which, Martineau tells us, had captivated the intellect of La Place, De Morgan, Buckle, and almost the whole host of scientific men of our own day'; an argument, we may add, which Pascal had refuted by anticipation when, to cure himself of the toothache, he tackled the mathematical problem of probabilities two hundred years before, though it is not dead yet. I have heard it from the lips of a University lecturer in Physics.

After references to previous writers from Origen onwards (p. 260), of which he says 'it has become common to take refuge in the mere plea of mystery,' he considers the arguments drawn from the theological conception of God as omniscient and, giving full weight to His foreknowledge often shown in prophecy, he gets to grips with the question 'Does then the Prescience, thus evidenced, involve determinism in human actions?' He is not talking of His foreknowledge in physical laws, which act in strict sequence of cause and effect and enable us, for example, to predict eclipses of the sun and moon, but of 'an infinite Mind' (p. 263), which, 'instead

[6] *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (Longmans, 1865), 2nd edition; ch. vii, 'The Philosophy of the Conditioned, as applied by Mr. Mansel,' p. 88.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

of being shut up in a closed and mechanised universe, lives amid the free play of variable character and contingent history, into which there is room for approval, pity, and love to flow.' Of such he asks, 'Is this a limitation of God's foresight?' and answers:

> 'Yes; but it is a self-limitation just like his abstinence from causing them: lending us a portion of his causation, he refrains from covering all with his omniscience.'

And (p. 264) he quotes Dugald Stewart:[7]

> 'There is no absurdity in supposing that the Deity may, for wise purposes, have chosen to open a source of contingency in the voluntary action of his creatures to which no prescience can possibly extend.'

But even before that Sir William Hamilton had written (1828):

> 'Shall we venture to affirm that it exceeds the Power of God to permit such a train of contingent events to take place as His foreknowledge shall not extend to? Does not such a proposition detract from the omnipotence of God in the same proportion in which it seems to exalt His omniscience?' (*ibid.*, p. 398).

Further, in his *Dogmatic Theology*, Section 116 (1849), the Danish Theologian Martensen pointed out that 'A God literally foreknowing all things' would Himself have no freewill but would be

> 'merely the spectator of events decided and predestined from eternity, not the all-directing governor in a drama of freedom which He carries on in reciprocal conflict and work with the freedom of the creature.'

VI.

Does it really matter? At such a time as this, when the great issues of the war are still undecided, is it really fit, as Cassius might have asked, 'that every nice (theological) offence should bear its comment'? I think it is. For if we accustom ourselves to hold side by side in our minds mutually contradictory and irreconcilable ideas about God, resigning ourselves to say 'it's all a mystery,' that will mean that our ideas of Him will be confused, unthought-out, vague, unsupported by reason. They will be built merely on Feelings, Custom and Tradition. And on our reasoned belief in God all depends.

It will not stop there. We shall find we have set up a habit of mind in other things. The habit of unreasoned acquiescence will spread. We shall find ourselves accepting apparent contradictions in our ideas about Christ, in our worship, in the Moral Law and practice. We shall find we have accustomed ourselves to use words without meaning, to have entertained what Plato called the 'lie in the soul.' We shall find ourselves joining in the cry against 'Creeds and Dogmas,' not because they are false, but because they deal with matters of which 'we can have no real knowledge.' In repudiating the authority of Reason and Clear Thought, we shall find ourselves building our policy of life on Expediency, Prejudice, and Passion.

[7] *Words*, ed. Hamilton, Vol. VI, p. 401, 'Active and Moral Powers.'

ARCHBISHOP SHARP AND HIS 'POOR RELATIONS'

A Study in Archiepiscopal Nepotism

By the Rev. A. T. Hart, M.A., B.D., Vicar of Bordesley Green.

WHEN John Sharp was enthroned as Archbishop of York in July, 1691, it was said that he had scarcely an enemy in the world. He possessed, however, a large number of needy and greedy relations, mainly from the clerical and legal professions, who were fully alive to the value of at least one text in Scripture: 'Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together.'

The Archbishop's only sister, Hannah, who was three years younger than himself, had married John Richardson, attorney-at-law, the third son of Richard Richardson of Bierley Hall, a near neighbour of the Sharps at Bradford.[1] Neither the Sharps nor the Richardsons were wealthy or important families: Thomas, the Archbishop's father, was a drysalter and oil dealer in Bradford, and Dr. Richardson, F.R.S., a small squire and yeoman farmer, living a mile or so outside the town. Third sons do not, as a rule, inherit much of the ancestral estates, and the Law, although it certainly sharpens the wits, often fails to provide either a substantial or a regular income. Hannah had five children, two sons and three daughters, to fit for the rough-and-tumble of life, and not unnaturally she turned to her eldest and most successful brother, the new Primate of England, to solve her troubles. Sharp nobly shouldered the burden, forgetting how, when young and obscure himself, the Richardsons had refused him the living of Wibsey.[2] John, the eldest, became the Archbishop's chaplain in 1698, and then, some years later, his secretary as well.[3] Finally, he was appointed Precentor of York and a Residentiary Canon (1712). But the Archbishop's benevolence towards his nephews and nieces did not cease here. Dorothy, the eldest girl, was introduced to and ultimately married Edmund Wickins, another of Sharp's chaplains and the tutor of his sons, for whom he secured with much trouble the wealthy rectory of Kirbythore, in Westmoreland, from the Earl of Thanet.[4] The Earl himself was at first reluctant to accept Wickins as incumbent of this particular living, since he strongly desired a man who would stay there for

[1] *Life and Correspondence of Abraham Sharp*, W. Cudworth, p. 260.
[2] *Round about Bradford*, W. Cudworth, p. 41.
[3] *Autobiographical Memoranda*, H. Dering, Surtees Society; Vol. LXV, pp. 340 and 344.
[4] *ibid.*, p. 340.

the rest of his life and give up all thoughts of further promotion, which he suspected the chaplain would not wish to do. Accordingly Thanet wrote to the Primate:

> 'I am fully satisfied of the character you give him, but I must think it would not be reasonable in me to expect that a man of his merit should be confined there all his life when he has so just expectations of other preferments, & truly my desire is to have some honest man that knows by experience what it is to live retired in his Parish, & would never expect other preferments.' [5]

Nevertheless his scruples were overruled, and Wickins was appointed. The third daughter, Sarah, married John Clarkson, a scion of that famous Bradford family which had already intermarried, and fought side by side, with the Sharps during the Civil Wars. It will be remembered that Mary Clarkson married John Sharp, the cloth manufacturer and Parliamentarian of Little Horton, who was a friend of Sir Thomas Fairfax and later his private secretary. Her brother, David, after fighting valiantly against the Royalists in Bradford, was preferred with John Sharp's help to a Fellowship at Clare, Cambridge, where he became the tutor of Archbishop Tillotson. Tillotson, the life-long friend of Archbishop Sharp, always retained the greatest admiration for David Clarkson; so it is scarcely surprising to learn that John Clarkson was also in due course promoted to a Prebend in York Minster and to the Vicarage of Silkstone.[6]

Bishopthorpe was undoubtedly at this period a hive of family industry, besides being a source of family income. Mrs. Moseley, the Primate's nonconformist mother-in-law, made that citadel of Anglicanism the home of her declining years, and, what was worse, was buried in the Minster.[7] Heneage Dering, one of the most flagrant pluralists of the eighteenth century, who had come to the Palace in the rôle of the Archbishop's private lay secretary, played his cards particularly well. He was another lawyer, but in 1701 was ordained deacon and priest within the year and became the Archbishop's chaplain. From then on his promotion was rapid. Queen Anne at Sharp's bidding gave him first the rich living of Scrayingham, and later the Deanery of Ripon. He also was presented with a Prebend at York.[8] Heneage was the son of one of Sharp's oldest and greatest friends, but in 1712 he forged a closer link when the Primate married him to his own daughter in Bishopthorpe Chapel.[9] The Weddells, Sharp's maternal relations, like-

[5] Lloyd-Baker-Sharp MSS., Box 4, Bundle A, epistle 54.

[6] *Life and Correspondence of Abraham Sharp*, Cudworth, p. 260.

[7] *See* Lloyd-Baker-Sharp MSS., Box 3, Bundle K, epistle 4; *also* Surtees Society, Vol. LXV, p. 340: 'This summer Mrs. Moseley, Mother to Mrs. Sharp, died at Bishopthorpe where she had lived some years & was buried in York Minster,' *i.e.* on May 22, 1698.

[8] *See* D.N.B.; Heneage Dering.

[9] *See* Bishopthorpe Register.

wise stuck close to the Archiepiscopal gaiters. Thomas Sharp had married Dorothy, the daughter of John Weddell, Rector of Widdington, whose son and grandson became attorneys-at-law in Bradford. They, too, shared in the Church's blessings. J. Pelham wrote to the Archbishop on October 4th, 1698:

> 'Mr. Weddel I put into a way proper for him immediately & will take all the care of him I can.'[10]

Two years later a second letter arrived:

> 'My Lord. A Landwaiter in the Port of London being lately removed to be Land surveyor, I offered my service to Mr. Weddell to procure him the Landwaiter's place, & upon application to the Board it was granted him, he chooses rather to accept this than stay any longer for a vacancy among the King's waiters, whose employment is less profitable tho' it be more easy. I must own that I grew very impatient at this Gentleman's waiting so long for a place, & was extremely glad of this opportunity to do a service to one for whom your Grace is concerned, being with the greatest respect imaginable
>
> My Lord
> Your Grace's most faithful & obedient Servant
> London. Jan. 11 1700.'[11] HENRY BOYLE.

Again, Mrs. Sharp, *née* Elizabeth Palmer of the yeoman Palmers of Winthorp in Lincolnshire, possessed plenty of relations both there and in Nottingham, who hoped to pick up the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table. Her brother, Colonel William Palmer, who served in Major-General Wyndham's regiment, fought under Marlborough in Flanders and subsequently died of wounds received at the Battle of Blenheim.[12] The Archbishop struggled hard to persuade Queen Anne to continue another Mr. Palmer in 'the Teller's place' at the Treasury, which he had forfeited by his carelessness in allowing an 'under-clerk' to run away with £6,000.[13] In this Sharp failed; but his suggestion that the bitter pill of his dismissal should be gilded for the loser by a lump sum of the £6,000, which he was expected to refund to the Treasury, together with an annual pension of £1,000, both to be paid out of Privy purse, eventually resulted in the payment of a pension of £2,000 per annum, for which William Palmer, the father of the erring 'Teller,' duly returned his grateful thanks.[14]

'The wise Archbishop of York,' wrote Professor G. M. Trevelyan (*England under Queen Anne*, Vol. I, Blenheim), 'whose motto was "no politics."' Trevelyan, of course, was referring to the well-established fact that Sharp consistently refused, despite powerful and repeated pleas to the contrary, to intervene in Parlia-

[10] Lloyd-Baker-Sharp MSS., Box 4, Bundle M, epistle 23.
[11] *ibid.*, Bundle Q, epistle 22.
[12] *ibid.*, Bundle M, epistle 4; Bundle A, epistle 81.
[13] *ibid.*, Bundle T, epistle 2.
[14] *ibid.*, Bundle M, epistle 3. June 27, 1702.

mentary elections either for the City or County of York. 'The other rule . . . which he laid down to himself was, never to be concerned in Parliamentary Elections.'[15] But unfortunately for the Archbishop's 'no politics' reputation, it was equally well known

> 'that he made no scruple in the Borough of Ripon (where the Archbishop hath a temporal jurisdiction) to recommend such candidates as he himself approved of. . . . And here it was that Mr. Sharp, his eldest son, did afterwards, upon his recommendation, establish an interest that preserved him in Parliament as long as the Archbishop lived.'[16]

'Spitfire' John Sharp, the younger, owed, indeed, not only his seat but his influence in the House of Commons and his place at the Board of Trade to the unqualified backing of his 'no politics' father. The Primate, on the other hand, found his M.P. son useful on several occasions, notably when between them they helped very materially to defeat the High Tories' attempt to 'tack' the Land Tax, the main prop of the war-effort, which they knew the Lords' dared not throw out, to that highly controversial and purely party measure, the Occasional Conformity Bill.

Finally, there was Cousin Dan Oughton, the insolvent Vicar of Whitby, who wrote from that town on October 5th, 1699:

> 'May it please your Grace
>
> I return your Lordship hearty thanks for the great favours you have honoured me with, in sending me to this place, & supporting me with such a supply of money, as hath been very comfortable to me in my present necessities . . . & I hope I shall never forget the promise I made to Your Grace & to Almighty God, when I was last at Bishopthorpe: I ordered all my money due to me at York to pay Mr. Webster; & intend to sell all my effects at Yarum, to clear all I owe there: there is still a considerable sum due at Yarum, which I will discharge as fast as I can raise money, & then I question not I shall go on cheerfully in the duty of my function, without any distraction of thought: If these debts were paid, I should have a comfortable subsistence from this Curacy: & if I might have the addition of the Rural Deanery of this town & the precincts of it only; it would be the only object of my ambition: & I do promise in the presence of God (the searcher of all hearts) that I will not fail punctually to return the money to the Court, as it becomes due. . . . I humbly beg your Lordship's pardon for this trouble; the occasion of this presumption was your Lordship's desire that I would give your Grace a true state of my affairs. I shall only crave leave to declare sincerely, that I am not more by affinity & obligation, than by the natural bent and inclination of my soul,
>
> Your Grace's most obedient son & servant,
>
> DAN OUGHTON.'[17]

Unfortunately this promised reformation of characted failed to materialise; for, some five years later, he was complaining to the Archbishop of his 'empty circumstances,' *i.e.* want of money, and declared 'were it not for my cheerful spirit supported I thank God

[15] *Life of Sharp*, Vol. I, p. 121. [16] *ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 126 and 127.
[17] Lloyd-Baker-Sharp MSS., Box 4, Bundle E, epistle 27.

ith a good conscience, I should soon faint under my burdens.'[18] hat cheerfulness of spirit, however, as he frankly acknowledged, as mainly upheld 'by your Grace's bountiful hand,' and pro- ssed himself to be more hurt by the Archbishop's stern reproofs an by all his money troubles :

> 'God knows my heart, all this is but like the raising of the skin, in comparison of that stab your Grace has given my heart in the charge of tipling & dosing & almost a whole neglect of my duty.'

ut the hard words were sweetened by cousinly gifts, and once gain Sharp was profusely thanked 'for that liberal supply which shortly so like to refresh me by your Grace's Bounty.'[19]

No bishop in Queen Anne's reign, or perhaps throughout the ntire eighteenth century, had Sharp's reputation for disinterested- ss in appointing the best men to the livings and prebends in his ft; and in recommending candidates to the Queen or his noble iends, in particular the Earl of Nottingham, for lay posts under e Crown, he justly prided himself on refusing to be influenced y birth or wealth or a powerful patron, but only by good character, dustry and piety.

> 'He guided himself in dispensing his favours to his clergy, not by their political principles, but by their moral characters and parochial labours.'[20]

et three at least of his private chaplains were members of his wn family, in each case merely the stepping-stone to rich, and or Heneage Dering at least, multiple preferment : Mr. Palmer ad to retire from the Teller's place because, as Nottingham ankly pointed out to Sharp, his reputation was so bad that the reasury simply couldn't put up with him : Cousin Dan Oughton's tters prove over and over again that he was no fit Vicar for Whitby and should never have been sent there in the first instance : nd finally Willis' eulogistic statement,

> 'he [Sharp] made it his unalterable practice to elect them (*viz.* prebendaries) out of such as lived in his diocese, and had recommended themselves by doing their duties in their respective parochial cures.'[21]

ngs a trifle hollowly when it is remembered that, quite apart from ie brothers Henry and Edward Finch, who were his old and uch beloved pupils, the Primate appointed his own son-in-law, ephew and niece's husband to three of these delectable prebends.

A striking commentary, surely, on the fact that in the eighteenth entury, in Church as in State, blood meant much more even to rchbishops than the most unblemished character, and the little nger of a son-in-law or a distant cousin was far thicker than the ighest talents or the noblest sainthood.

[18] *ibid.*, epistle 29.
[19] *ibid.*, epistle 28.
[20] *Life of Sharp*, Vol. I, p. 140.
[21] *ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 120.

A SERVICE OF INFANT BAPTISM *

An opening Hymn may be sung or the following Psalm:

O how amiable are thy dwellings: thou Lord of hosts!

My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God.

Yea, the sparrow hath found her an house and the swallow a nest where she may lay her young: even thy altars, O Lord of hosts, my King and my God.

Blessed is the man whose strength is in thee: in whose heart are thy ways.

For the Lord God is a light and defence: the Lord will give grace and worship, and no good thing shall he withhold from them that live a godly life.

O Lord God of hosts: blessed is the man that putteth his trust in thee.

The Parents and Godparents standing at the font and the congregation standing facing the font, the Minister shall say:

Hear the words of the Gospel according to Saint Mark, written in the tenth chapter at the thirteenth verse:

They brought young children to Christ, that He should touch them; and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it He was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child he shall not enter therein. And He took them up in his arms, laid His hands upon them and blessed them.

Then shall the Minister speak to the Parents and Godparents as follows:

Brothers and sisters in Christ, forasmuch as this child is God's child, you have brought him here that he may by Baptism be dedicated to God, His Heavenly Father, and admitted into the Church which is the fellowship of God's Son, Jesus Christ Our Lord.

* This revision of the Baptismal Service, published in the *Modern Churchman* (December 1943, pp. 249-255), has been made in response to the suggestions of reviewers and correspondents.—Ed. *M.C.*

In order that the saving power of Baptism may work in this child, it must be united to his Christian education:

Will you therefore faithfully train and help this child to resist all evil?

Answer: I will.

Will you take care that this child be instructed in the Christian Faith?

Answer: I will.

Will you pray for this child and by word and deed encourage him to keep God's holy will and commandments and to walk in the same all the days of his life?

Answer: I will.

Let us pray.

O Heavenly Father,

Grant to this child the spiritual strength to withstand temptation and to overcome the forces of evil. *Amen.*

Grant to this child the power of victorious faith and the daily experience that Thou art Mighty to save. *Amen.*

Grant to this child that he, increasing daily in the knowledge of Thee and of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, may ever grow into Thy Divine likeness. *Amen.*

Grant to this child that being brought up in the true knowledge of Thee and of Thy Son Jesus Christ he may never depart from the way that leadeth unto Eternal Life. *Amen.*

O Lord and Heavenly Father, whose Beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, was Himself baptized, and by His Spirit gave commandment to His disciples to teach all nations and baptize them; grant that Baptism may be to this child the abiding pledge of Thy Fatherly love and a daily reminder that he is dedicated to Thee and to Thy service in the fellowship of Christ's Church. *Amen.*

Here a hymn may be sung or the following Psalm:

Thy hands have made me and fashioned me: O give me understanding, that I may learn thy commandments.

Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statutes: and I shall keep it unto the end.

Give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law: yea, I shall keep it with my whole heart.

Make me to go in the path of thy commandments: for therein is my desire.

Then shall the Minister take the child into his arms and say:
Name this child.

Then, naming it, he shall baptize the child with water, saying:

N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. *Amen.*

or

N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

Then shall the Minister say:

We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock and do sign him with the sign of the Cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ Crucified, but manfully to fight under His banner against all evil, and continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end. *Amen.*

Let us thank God for the baptism of this child.

We yield Thee hearty thanks, most gracious Father, that it hath pleased Thee to receive this child into the fellowship of Christ's Church. Grant that he may ever be a loyal and loving member of this fellowship through Jesus Christ Our Lord. *Amen.*

Let us pray for the parents and their home.

O Heavenly Father, grant Thy blessing to the parents of this child : grant them grace that they may daily keep their promise to bring this child up as Thy child : shed Thy blessing upon them in their home : may the Spirit of love and peace abide there : may happiness be its possession and Thy divine protection its strength : through Jesus Christ Our Lord. *Amen.*

Let us pray for all baptized Christians.

O Heavenly Father whose son, Jesus Christ, was baptized in order that He might fulfil all righteousness, grant that all we who are baptized may seek first the righteousness of Thy Kingdom and, by true obedience unto the same, promote it among mankind after the example of our Saviour, Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

Let us say together the Lord's Prayer.

Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name; Thy Kingdom come; Thy Will be done, in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us; And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; For Thine is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

Here may be sung a Hymn or the following Psalm:

The Lord is my shepherd; therefore can I lack nothing.

He shall feed me in a green pasture: and lead me forth beside the waters of comfort.

He shall convert my soul: and bring me forth in the paths of righteousness, for his name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff comfort me.

Thy loving-kindness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

Then the Minister shall say to the Parents and Godparents:

Forasmuch as you have promised to train this child to be a Christian: I therefore beseech you in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lover of little children, that you fail not in this your promise. Earnestly endeavour to fit yourselves for the faithful discharge of your duty in this matter, and let your daily life be such that this child may ever look on you with love and reverence, and learn the lesson of true religion from your life as well as from your lips.

You are to take care that this child be taught to say his Prayers and to attend Divine Worship; and that in due course he may be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him, and thereafter be admitted to the Holy Communion.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all. *Amen.*

ALFRED LOISY*

By the Rev. Canon R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt., author of *Christian Belief and Practice*, etc.

A LAST sheet of flame from the soul of Maude Petre has seared Catholicism with this record of the prince of Catholic Modernists. The author's literary executor, who saw the book finally through the press after her death at the age of 80, speaks of Loisy as a great heresiarch; but the frontispiece of the little French scholar in no wise conforms to the authentic description of a heresiarch recently drawn for us by Dr. Hensely Henson in his *Retrospect*. And there is something pathetic in Loisy's repudiation of the rôle. Writing to the Master of the Sacred Palace in 1901, he says:

> 'I have tried to show that the certain or probable evidence of criticism and history can be reconciled with the principles of Catholic doctrine, or, rather, how from history thus renewed a favourable testimony to the supernatural reality of revelation can be drawn. . . . Very Rev. Father, I have not in me the making of a heresiarch or even a heretic. During the twenty-two years of my priesthood I have served the Church with all the devotion of which I am capable' (p. 47).

Loisy made one last effort, before his excommunication in 1907, to remain in the Church for which until the end he felt an acute nostalgia—in the correct sense of that much-abused word. Writing to the Pope himself, he said:

> 'Holy Father, I know your goodness and appeal to your heart. I want to live and die in the communion of the Catholic Church, and I do not want to contribute to the ruin of faith in my country. I cannot destroy in myself the results of my work. So far as lies in my power I submit to the judgment passed on my writings. . . .
>
> 'As proof of my sincerity, and to pacify minds, I am prepared to renounce my teaching in Paris, and to suspend the scientific publications which I have in preparation' (p. 50).

Was there ever a more genuine *cri du coeur*? But the Tiger (today in process of canonisation) stretched out his paw and tore him. This is what Pius X wrote in his reply, sent through the Archbishop of Paris:

> 'I have received a letter from Abbé Loisy. . . . He appeals to my heart; but the letter was not written from his own heart. . . .'

Years after, when Loisy told this monstrous story of his treatment by the *Servus servorum Dei*, he exclaimed:

> 'When I heard these words something broke in my heart.'

He never recovered from the blow. But he humbly accepted the ruling that his place was outside his Church, nor ever suffered

**Alfred Loisy: his religious significance.* By Maude Petre. (Cambridge University Press, 1944; price 7/6.)

nyone to say a word against her. True wisdom, he remarks, ould have directed his energies into the sphere of diocesan ad- inistration; and Louis Canet, to whom this book is dedicated, dged that the faithful priest would have become a great and oted bishop. Or, had his studies been in natural science, he ight have pursued them unmolested and, like the Abbé Breuil, ill have remained in the Catholic Church; for in that world of ualism things may be accounted scientifically true and theologic- lly false. But Loisy's studies were in Christian origins, and he ad felt compelled to draw a distinction between the historical ense of the Biblical texts and the traditional sense 'which has een grafted on to them by the work of faith' (p. 17). Even though e claimed that the factual history in the Gospels justified the aditional sense put upon it by Catholicism, this solution was ecessarily unacceptable to his Church, which proclaims the Scrip- ures, uncritically examined, to be themselves the historical proof f its teaching. Duchesne, the great *savant*, who had early noted oisy's ability and desired to advance his career, had also tried keep him from these dangerous studies, urging that Scriptural xegesis must inevitably bring him into hopeless

> 'conflict with the theologians. He pointed out to me further . . . with what ease I could pursue an honourable career in the domain of Semitic philology, with the prospect of that Paradise of the learned, a chair in the Institute.'

ut Loisy despised a man who seemed not ready to venture all the cause of religion and truth. And von Hügel, who also had iscovered Loisy and expressed pain that anyone should strive turn him from the Scriptural issues, boldly pointed out to Rome ne bad effect that the condemnation of a scholar like Loisy would ave upon the thinking world — thus staving off the evil day for ng. It was, however, characteristic of von Hügel, says Miss etre, to urge his collaborators into dangerous positions and then be distressed if they went beyond the point which he intended; hd the man who had disregarded Duchesne's advice soon dis- garded von Hügel's too. The Baron, who assumed generalship ver the Catholic Modernists, had this experience with them all: ne 'pieces' on his chess-board 'showed they were alive and self- oving,' as Miss Petre puts it. And it is undoubtedly the case nat Modernism, as a movement in any church, is robbed of its nmediate effectiveness by the intense individualism of its mem- ers, who can hardly be brought to unite upon any particular issue. n Miss Petre's judgement the distinguishing characteristic of Modernists is hopefulness; and the Catholic Modernists were nited by hope alone,

> '. . . hope that the Church would not repudiate the truths of science and history; hope that their own labours might conduce to this cause; hope,

> more than hope, that the spiritual essence of dogma would survive all assaults of unbelieving criticism; hope in the indestructibility of faith and its capacity for the absorption of all human truth and knowledge' (p. 40).

As each of them lost hope, so he ceased to be a Modernist. Loisy himself lost hope when he saw that every effort that he made was blocked. It was not only intellectual liberty in the Church that he had striven for, but a deeper spirituality, and both were made impossible by dogmatic orthodoxy. In Miss Petre's words,

> 'Orthodoxy', for him, signified the intransigent defence of religious dogmas, not in a purely spiritual, but in a quasi-scientific sense; for it seemed to him that theologians claimed for theology a double quality of certainty, the quality of faith and the quality of assured scientific truth' (pp. 16-17).

But, said he,

> 'theology is the philosophy of revelation; not revelation itself, nor religion; not faith, nor even, strictly speaking, the object of faith. . . . Its whole value is as an interpretation of faith' (p. 78).

Accordingly he maintained that there is an underlying religious meaning to the traditional dogmatic statements, and he tried to persuade his Church that this spiritual doctrine is immune from historical difficulties. Make theology dynamic, instead of static, and the conflict with science disappears.

> 'What we have to do is to renew theology from top to bottom, to substitute the religious for the dogmatic spirit, to seek the soul of theological truth and leave reason free under the control of conscience' (p. 13).

Moreover the history of the Church itself provided him with reasonable hope, he thought, of accomplishing this transformation. His following words express a truth which was often emphasized also by Dean Rashdall:

> 'Clever people, on the strength of what happened later, will not fail to say that orthodoxy is an impassable barrier, against which I could but speedily break myself. But such persons know, or ought to know, as well as I do, that orthodoxy is only unchangeable in the imagination of those who hold to it, and that this supposedly unchangeable doctrine has been continually modified in the course of centuries and that it is changed before our eyes, often, even by those who boast of protecting its inviolability' (p. 16).

When the fresh development of orthodoxy which Loisy anticipated did not take place, he ceased not only to be a Modernist but also to be a Christian. 'I was forced,' he said, 'to plant my faith elsewhere.' But in working out this faith his mind seems to have moved on very abstract lines. He was groping in a darkened world, though there is a link between his old faith and his new in his depreciation of reason. It was well enough to quarrel with theology on the ground that it failed in respect both for the unknown and the unknowable, but quite another matter to set reason and faith in opposition. Miss Petre says that

> 'Any description of God seemed to him an intrusion of reason into the domain of faith. But this was not to deny divine reality, nor the mystical perception thereof.'

In short, Loisy seems to have reduced faith to an emotion, instead of regarding it as an activity of the whole personality. Dean Inge, who exposed faithfully this (and other) weaknesses of Catholic Modernism, has laid it down as stedfastly as Loisy that 'the formless intuitions of the mystical consciousness are the bedrock of religious faith,' but the Dean is clear that reason must build some structure upon them. Faith must have a content. 'Take away reason,' in the words of the Cambridge Platonist, 'and all religions are alike true.' What we must indeed not think that we can do, in Loisy's own true words, is 'to enclose the absolute in syllogisms'; but there is a world of difference between this and his untroubledness as to the personality and even the existence of God. The fact is that even in his Catholic days Loisy's religion seems never to have been an intimate relationship between a personal God and his own soul. What he had believed in was first the unseen and, secondly, 'the spirit of the universal community of believers,' which he identified with Christ and which 'is not the Galilean prophet who was crucified' (p. 92). And when he ceased to be a Catholic it was, in essence, these ideas which he proceeded to develop. Religion was for him essentially social — which it is not, although something social belongs to its essence — and 'mystical humanity' was the myth round which the rites and symbols of the religion of the future would be constructed (p. 101). How depressing a faith! It must, however, be remembered that faith in humanity was for 'Loisy,

> 'not faith in the human race as such, in our feeble personalities, but in the spirit which informs and uplifts humanity' (p. 106).

As to who, and what, that spirit is, Loisy would only say that He is more real than we are. The following passage written in 1930 is typical:

> 'Who leads us? A question almost blasphemous, or at any rate without significance. If there were a *who*, it would be humanity; but it is not humanity because humanity does not walk of itself, it is not a living liberty. Well, then, there is no *who* measurable by its yard-stick. It is nevertheless a fact that this arrogant vermin is solidaire with the planet that bears it and with the whole universe, of which it is part, contained and continuing. But that with which humanity is solidaire and on which it is dependent is not someone as occupied with it as it is with itself. Is it capable of sounding and understanding and defining Him? It may have been thought so, but what presumption! . . . Some intellectual and moral asceticism would not be amiss before reconstructing a metaphysic, if the wish to do so should return. To save the future of humanity on the planet might be a more noble occupation if it could understand and undertake it, and it might be the only labour that would please the Eternal, if He deigned to regard it' (pp. 38-39).

Yet Loisy never ceased to pray, and he devoted time to meditation every day. And perhaps there are not a few who have given up Christianity who may be helped by his example and by his gropings after a new faith.

This is a very interesting little book, and not least interesting is the appendix consisting of a selection of Loisy's letters. But it is not an easy book, nor is its meaning always clear, owing no doubt to its partly being written during air-raids and to the extracts being translations; also it presupposes considerable knowledge of Loisy's writings. Miss Petre's object was to present the leading characteristics of Loisy's work and teaching from the religious point of view, on the grounds that his main interest in life was a religious and not a scientific one, and that he had a real contribution to make to the religion of the Catholic Church. She even thinks, in a gruesome picture of that Church as a living creature (p. 53), that the life-blood of the Modernists is circulating through it, and that it is in the throes of digestive pains through the victims it was compelled to devour. The simile is apt, but we fear the creature has not changed its nature and is ever ready for more of the same diet. (It is always dangerous to think and speak of the Church as 'she.') But the Church of England took *its* stand four hundred years ago on the acceptance of new truth as revelation, and two of Loisy's teachings above-mentioned claim acceptance; namely, that the New Testament literature is catechetical rather than historical in purpose, and that the value of traditional dogma lies in the spiritual truth which it was originally designed to convey. These teachings have, in fact, already taken root among us. But they must not be used to shroud the historical element of the Gospels in swirling mists, or to justify the view that Christianity was the creation of religious faith instead of the interpretation of the fact of Jesus. Nor will it do to justify the retention of dogmatic formularies in our worship on the ground that truth is enshrined in these ancient settings, for this is to equate religion with antiquarianism. The spiritual truths of Christianity cannot speak to-day with vivifying power unless they are made intelligible, as Loisy insisted that they were originally, by being integrated with what belongs to contemporary knowledge and environment.

A brief memoir of Maude Petre herself forms the introduction to this 'Petrine' view of Loisy. She died, as she had lived, a Modernist, the only one of that brilliant Roman Catholic band who never lost hope, although she paid the penalty of 'a partial local pseudo-excommunication' and was deprived of graveside rites at her burial. But let us end with Tyrrell's note of gaiety, when he described her as pushing the 'Rome Express' which had stuck:

> Lo, in the rear an Amazon who shoves,
> And murmurs to herself: 'I feel it moves';
> Herself immobile, nothing can defeat her;
> Rock versus Rock, and Petre versus Peter.

THE EDUCATION BILL AND ITS OPPORTUNITIES*

By Miss A. M. Ashley, M.A., Headmistress of the Honor Oak School.

THE provisions of the Education Bill which deal with religious education are very important. But the real importance of religious education is not by virtue of the place Scripture teaching has, or should have, in the curriculum of schools; nor is it because of the corporate act of worship with which the school day normally begins; but because spiritual and religious issues are inevitably involved in the whole structure of our education system — in the relation of the State to the child, the relation of the State to the teacher, and, most important of all, the relation between the teacher and the child. If religion is to have reality in our schools, and in our country, it is certainly not something imposed (as an extra, as it were) on an edifice otherwise complete, but it is implicit in the whole scheme, and necessary to its harmony, its beauty, its effectiveness and its strength.

I am not referring here to the spirit or organization in any one school, but to something more comprehensive — the whole structure of society as it involves our responsibility to the younger generation. (I do not forget the important part adult education should play in any national scheme, but my own experience has been mainly with young people, so that it will be wiser if I limit myself to them, and speak mainly of secondary education as I know it in girls' schools, maintained, aided or independent.)

In the discussions of this year, we are hearing much of 'statutory obligation,' 'agreed syllabuses,' 'reserved teachers,' and similar technicalities. These are the dry bones of the matter — essential of course to the structure, but ultimately of minor importance. It is the spirit behind legislation and administrative machinery which gives life and energy. The spirit cannot be defined, for

> 'the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not where it cometh and whither it goeth: so is everyone that is born of the Spirit.'

The Spirit cannot be assessed or measured. 'He giveth not the Spirit by measure.' But the bones, on the other hand, the bones are very many in the open valley, and lo they are very dry.' So to many of us here, and even more to many of the younger genera-

*A paper delivered to the Institute of Christian Education Conference on Training for a Christian Community,' at Tonbridge School, 13th May, 1944.

tion, the bones of the Education Bill are very dry, and 'there is no breath in them.' But the Lord said to Ezekiel,

> 'Prophesy unto the wind, prophesy son of man, and say to the wind, "Thus said the Lord God: come from the four winds, O Breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live." So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came upon them and they lived, and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army.'

So with the controversies which centre round the Bill. There are many administrative details which, to the impatient reader, seem pedestrian and uninspired; and there is too much which will necessarily be slow in development. The healthiest growth is not always the quickest; and especially now, when the difficulties of war-time, the multitudinous claims on man-power and the inevitable delay in training suitable teachers and building suitable buildings, make progress annoyingly slow. But the main purpose of the Bill, and the proposals foreshadowed in the White Paper which preceded it, imply, if they do not actually express, a view of life which is both religious and Christian.

Among the many pamphlets which have been published recently dealing with educational reconstruction, I have been especially impressed by one which has been issued by four London Headmasters,[1] dealing with the problems of religious education and the too commonly held opinion that teachers are unsympathetic to religious education. The writers state:

> 'Schoolmasters in general are not less but more concerned with religious values than the mass of the community.'

But two conditions must be fulfilled:

> 'The first is that the form of religious instruction adopted should command the sympathy and support of the great majority of the teachers themselves, whether directly engaged in religious instruction or not. Without the general co-operation of the staff, both in and out of the class-room, the life of the school cannot be permeated by the spirit of the religious instruction. The second condition is equally important. The religious instruction should meet the needs and difficulties of the pupils (particularly the older pupils) frankly and without prevarication.'

At present, too often we sin against the light. Too often the pursuit of truth and the topic of the lesson are *not* the same. The reason lies largely outside the schools. The writers go on to give it as their opinion that contact between the teaching of the Churches and modern thought will only be recovered by a 'thorough reform of creed and dogma.' I would rather say, by a wider and more general knowledge of the reform which has already taken place during the last thirty years (associated with the honoured names of Glazebrook, Rashdall, Streeter, the present Dean of St. Paul's and many others). A reinterpretation has been largely accomplished, but it is surprising how many people, otherwise well informed,

[1] *A Democratic Reconstruction of Education.*

now little or nothing about it, and do not realize that it *is* possible count oneself a Christian and also to be sincere and untrammelled in one's thought.

The discussions in the House of Commons and the many amendments proposed, and now under consideration, show that genuine interest in religious teaching is widespread. The time has come, in my opinion, for the Church to speak out boldly, and to show how welcome as members are those who sincerely wish to follow Christ but whose mental outlook is quite unlike that of their forefathers.

Sir Walter Moberley, in his otherwise helpful pamphlet, *The Church and the Teachers*, makes a serious mistake, I think, in the fourth stage. You remember his five stages — Scripture Knowledge, Christian Values, Faith in God, Faith in Christ, and Training in Churchmanship. For the purpose of his argument, in his fourth stage he suggests that Christian Faith should be understood in the sense in which it '. . . receives formulation in the Apostles' Creed.' Several clauses in the Apostles' Creed are, however, quite unacceptable to very many teachers, and indeed to public opinion in general. They can be rejected, and the worshipper may still call himself a Christian, and a *truly* orthodox Christian, if you use the word orthodox in its correct sense. I feel that wide expression should be given to this view. Some teachers are alarmed quite needlessly. They think that if they are to teach Scripture they must accept something to which their consciences and rational instincts say 'No.'

One of the greatest needs of this age is to show to such people that they *are* welcome as Christians, and that in fact they may be more truly orthodox than many who have claimed that name. I emphasize this liberty of thought in relation to the Bill as one would like teachers to be considering, a little more carefully than they sometimes do, how far the imposition of a statutory obligation (if it is imposed) need adversely affect or endanger their own intellectual integrity. In general, of course, I regret any suggestion of a 'statutory obligation.' One would wish that all the subjects included in the curriculum — Scripture as much as English or Arithmetic or Science or Physical Training — were there owing to the will of the parent and the teacher guided from on high. The large majority of schools already give a place to Religious Instruction, and already begin the day with an Assembly.

There is to be a development in technical education and in Young People's Colleges. To some extent they have their traditions still to make, and they certainly have their own special difficulties of building, organization and personnel. They will also have their own problems as to School Prayers. In *all* types of

schools one can imagine an embarrassing position where the Headmaster or the Headmistress is unable conscientiously to lead the school in worship, or where no member of the staff feels qualified to give religious instruction. Logically, I suppose, it is an untenable position — I mean for the law to require a daily act of worship and that religious instruction shall be given, and at the same time to provide that 'no teacher shall be required to give or be penalized for not giving religious instruction.' But we are an illogical people, and granted that public opinion in the general citizen body is in favour of a certain policy, it is hardly likely that teachers will hold a very different view. Much will depend on the Training Colleges and the Universities. I am tempted to say a good deal on this, as I am inclined to think that the teachers on the staffs of the Training Colleges and Universities hold the key positions, and on them, above all, the future of religious education depends; but this matter is outside my terms of reference.

To return to the daily service, the main point is not so much that it should take place as that it should be worthy in character. Great diversity in the character of the assembly will be permissible. The Bill does not even suggest that the 'corporate act of worship and religious instruction' need be specifically Christian. This is, I think, sometimes misunderstood. In England our religious heritage is Christian, and therefore normally our worship is presumably Christian and the instruction given will normally deal mainly with New Testament Christianity, its later development and its Old Testament background; but the Education Bill does not insist on this. In the school I attended as a child, the service was often of such a character as to be equally acceptable to Jews and Christians alike—and we never noticed any difference. There will be problems and difficulties, no doubt, but I hope they may not be insuperable, and that the children may have opportunities at school to develop that capacity for worship which is apparently natural to so many of them.

With regard to the agreed syllabus, one wishes it could be called instead a *Handbook of Suggestions* — that is, in fact, what most of them are, and what their framers wish them to be. Personally I regret that they are to be mentioned in the Bill. They sound cramping, but have not really that aim. Those already published are probably serving, in the main, a useful purpose, and one hopes that the representatives of the Christian Communities, of teachers, and of Local Education Authorities who draw up the syllabuses will be wisely chosen and guided in their labours. It is important that the syllabus should be 'of a simplicity and breadth that will permit of individual interpretations' (I quote here from the recommendations of the Modern Churchmen's Union, recently printed

in the *Times Educational Supplement*). Actually the main use of the syllabus will be to protect the child from the follies of the crank, the sectarian, the extremist or the slacker. This also should be the function of the inspector, and it is surely right that this part of a school's activity should be open to properly qualified inspectors just as much as any other. (In practice it has been found, I believe, that if a subject is not open to inspection it loses rather than gains in dignity.)

With regard to the Dual System, I personally regret its retention. I wish that that section of the Church of England which favoured its abolition had prevailed rather than the section who, from varied and quite understandable motives, were strongly in favour of keeping some denominational schools. The result is a compromise, not fully satisfactory. In comparison, however, with the bitter controversy of forty years ago, the atmosphere of sympathy and mutual give-and-take is infinitely better. It looks as though ultimately denominational schools will die a natural death. Already I gather there is remarkably little difference in the characteristics of the children in both types of school. The main point is that the bitterness and lack of charity of forty years ago should not be revived. However, this is a big subject, too big to develop now.

To sum up: I regret the statutory obligation, I regret the 'agreed syllabus,' I regret the 'dual system'; I see the possible danger of something verging on 'tests for teachers'; and yet in spite of all this, I hope the Bill, with minor emendations, will pass into law, and I hope that parents, education authorities and teachers will carry out its provisions with all their hearts. For though the letter killeth, the spirit quickeneth, and with the guidance of the Spirit of God, and with that charity which is the bond of union, the true welfare of the children will be advanced.

ST. LUKE'S THREE WORDS FROM THE CROSS

By the Rev. C. F. Russell, M.A., B.D., Hulsean Lecturer, Cambridge.

OF the seven 'Words from the Cross,' one is recorded by both Matthew and Mark, three are recorded only by Luke, and three only by John. From what source did St. Luke obtain this particular information?

As the friend of St. Paul, he could make use of all that St. Paul told him; but was St. Paul in a position to tell him anything about the words of Jesus that was not already known to others also,

and so was likely to be included in other narratives or collections of sayings? St. Paul certainly knew one saying of Jesus which was not so recorded, but the Words from the Cross seem to be in a rather special category.

The greatest influence on St. Paul, preparing him for the vision on the road to Damascus, was his contact with Stephen. Paul was doubtless a prominent member of the synagogue of the Cilicians in Jerusalem where Stephen carried on some of his disputations on behalf of the Christian faith: he probably heard Stephen's defence before the Sanhedrin; he was certainly present at Stephen's death. His own speech recorded in *Acts* xxii shows that he recognized how profoundly the part he had played before and at the death of Stephen had influenced his life. His own work was the completion of what Stephen had begun.

I have never seen any reference to the correspondence of the last three utterances of Stephen, after the conclusion of his formal speech, with those three words which Luke, and only Luke, records. Of course, the last *two* utterances of Stephen, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge,' and 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,' have always been noticed for their resemblance to the words of Jesus, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,' and 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' But may we not add that those other words of Stephen, 'Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God,' send our thoughts back to that other Lucan word, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise'? Heaven is opened to him, and, as many commentators have said, the *standing* of the Son of Man suggests the idea not only of aid but of welcome.

If this is not fanciful, we have the remarkable fact that the three Words which are peculiar to Luke's Gospel were the last thoughts in the mind, and inspired the last words on the lips, of Stephen when Saul stood by, consenting unto his death.

The rest of what I have to say is purely conjectural, but I think it is worth consideration. May not Stephen have been present at the Crucifixion, and heard those three Words, and treasured them in his heart? And if so, must he not have spoken of them again and again to his closest friends? And, lastly, when Paul went after his conversion to Jerusalem, where in his disputes with the Hellenists he took up at once the work that Stephen had initiated, would it not have been one of his most eager desires, and one of his earliest actions, to get into touch with those who had known Stephen as their friend, and to learn all that they could tell him about the man to whom, more than to anyone save Christ Himself, he owed his soul?

A PHILOSOPHIC APPROACH TO THE INCARNATION*

By the Rev. H. Bulcock, M.A., President of the Modern Free Churchmen's Union.

I.

THE Incarnation is primarily a study of the nature of God and of the significance of the human race. Our approach must be along the lines of the Divine Immanence, the conception of God as in some way dwelling in the universe and not separate from it, as in Deism, nor fundamentally alien to it, as in some forms of Theism. The grounds for such a belief in the Divine Immanence may be briefly indicated.

(*a*) Philosophy finds it difficult to be satisfied with the idea of a universe divided up into two absolutely separated compartments.

(*b*) The pattern of the world as we see it is that of an all-embracing organism. Everything is related to everything else.

(*c*) The very quality of our self-consciousness implies the conception of an infinite as well as a finite. 'Man is a finite-infinite being conscious of finitude only through the presence of an infinite nature within himself.'[1]

(*d*) The very essence of religion involves a vital relationship of God and man. A God divorced from the world has no meaning for us.

(*e*) The characteristic feature of Religious Mysticism is the sense 'that we become one with the Absolute and are aware of our oneness.'[2]

The universe then takes on a double aspect. It is at the same time one and many; infinite and a multitude of finites; eternal and changing. We have a symbol of this double-sided constitution in any organism. The one body has many members. We may think of white light with a quality of its own, which contains in itself, however, the varied colours of the spectrum. We may think of a picture which makes a general *ensemble* impression upon us as we stand back and look at it as a whole, but which we can also examine as a multitude of details, lines, colours, light and shade. The cinematograph film can be regarded as a unified moving

* Since sending us this paper, its author has passed away, to the great loss of his congregation and the Modern Free Churchmen's Union.—Ed., *M.C.*

[1] Pringle-Pattison, *The Idea of God*, p. 247. [2] William James.

picture, but we know that it is produced by the swift merging succession of a multitude of separate tiny photographs. In the light of these illustrations, we may appreciate the conception presented by Professor Pringle-Pattison in his Gifford Lectures on *The Idea of God*. He claims that his text and the outcome of his argument may be stated thus :

> 'God is immanent; the Divine is revealed in the structure and system of finite experience' (p. 215). 'What we have to deal with is *the continuous manifestation of a single Power*' (p. 210).

There can be no adequate conception of God without both the Transcendent and Immanent aspects. The mystic realizes the transcendent aspect of God, eternal, infinite, perfect, complete, numinous, worshipful. This transcendent form of reality can only be suggested under symbols and anthropomorphic figures. We cannot treat the One embracing the Many as One *among* the Many. Our pictures of God, our theological dramas, can only be regarded as symbolic of truths which in their pure form are beyond telling. They are 'myths' in the Platonic sense, suggesting rather than stating truths.

But there must be together with this transcendent aspect of Godhead, which can only be conveyed in symbols and images, a complementary conception of God, as it were, analyzed, or manifested in time, revealing his nature and meaning in the finite processes of human life. We must not only gain, as we can, an impression of the picture as a whole, but examine the lines and colours which make it up. In the spectacle of evolving race-life are we not beholding the eternal reality manifesting its nature in moral terms? Is moral character conceivable in an amorphous Oneness? We need a world of individuals, of contrasts, of need, growth, moral choice, limitations and conquests over them, in order to express the meaning of morality. Even the manifestation of the moral nature of God seems to involve Incarnation in the broad sense of Immanence in such a world as we find it.

II.

We are of course conscious that this view of God raises several problems. The following notes may give some brief suggestions of approach to their solutions.

(*a*) This statement of immanence is distinguished from static pantheism by its element of evolutionary process and by its emphasis on degrees and values. There is no point of making a mere collection of things and calling it God. A pantheism which makes a deity of a stone, a cow or a monkey is devoid of significance. The Divine does not manifest itself evenly. The fundamental idea of manifestation involves discrimination and perspective, less

developed and more developed stages. The moral universe is no flat plain. It has hills and valleys. To realize God in the universe we must 'consider not stocks and plants but the most reasonable and perfect creatures.'[3]

(*b*) Moral manifestation involves contrasts of good and evil and a field for moral growth. Moral evil and stages of imperfection are thus implied. It would transgress the principle of values to identify a human sinner with God, yet whenever a sinner makes a struggle against sin, or even realizes that sin is sin, something mean, unlovely and unworthy of his best, there is a revelation of the Divine Nature.

(*c*) Pringle-Pattison claims that his study of God has two main conclusions, 'the immanence of God and the *reality of appearances*' (p. 216). The world of manifestation is no *maya*, or illusion. The parts are as real and concrete as the whole, and the reality of the whole rests upon the reality of the parts. The whole picture could not be what it is if the single details were not what they are. So it must be insisted that all the factors of moral manifestation, *e.g.* individuality and sin, are real and not illusive. If there be not a reality of struggle at the present hour there could be no reality in the struggle and victory which eternity, as it were, sums up.

(*d*) There is a problem of creation. What ultimate Mind devised this key scheme of manifestation? Our answer must be that this is a question suggested by our finite experiences of cause and effect, and as applied to eternity is not legitimate. As Pringle-Pattison suggests,

> 'It is not necessary to go beyond the child's question, "Who made God?" to become aware of the metaphysical insufficiency of the *Genesis* statement, "In the beginning God made heaven and earth"' (p. 299).

Creation can mean not so much an event in time, or an evolutionary process with a dated beginning, as an assertion of the spiritual significance for existence as a whole. It does not compel as its corollary the setting up of a transcendent Deistic Creator over against and apart from the universe which lives and moves and has its being in Him.

III.

Next we come to the problem of Personality — Human and Divine. We must say there is a Divine Personality. Sir Oliver Lodge's argument is convincing:

> 'It would be a strange kind of All that included mountains and trees, the forces of nature and the visible material universe only and excluded the intelligence, the will, the emotions, the individuality or personality of which we ourselves are immediately conscious.'

[3] Spinoza, quoted by Pringle-Pattison.

But we do not regard the Personality of God as isolated, but rather as the personalities of the finites under the infinite aspect —*sub specie aeternitatis*. Thus we must study personality in the only field where we as finite beings encounter it, that is, *in human relationships*. Personality as it appears in finite relations, morality as it works out between man and man, is a sectional expression of the real but ineffable personality and morality of the Absolute.

The Divine Personality, however, must not be regarded as human personalities merged in some way into a Group Unit or a Group Soul separable from the souls of individuals. Experience of a Group Soul as a matter of fact only means the intensification of the individual soul, not the obliteration of it through the creation of a new unit. When a man falls in love he does not lose his individuality but finds unsuspected possibilities in it. There is no merge into a previously non-existent unit. Our idea of the Divine Oneness does not mean an individual annihilation or merge into an amorphous whole. The tree does not become one by the leaf ceasing to be the leaf. The picture does not become one by rubbing out the detail. Abolish the Many and the One disappears with them.

Individuality must therefore be retained and respected in our conception. Divine Personality is not realized by the effacing of individual personality, but the approximation to it is actually made by means of individual personality. *The 'register,' as it were, of the Divine Personality lies in the finest and noblest type of human individualism.* God is not expressed best through colourless, self-effacing, hollow, mediumistic creatures, but in men of pronounced personality who think and act from the fulness of a developed nature.

'No man hath seen God at any time.' He may be conscious of an ineffable Infinite or Absolute in his state of cosmic consciousness or religious mysticism; he may become aware of idealistic aspirations in his own soul which he may broadly identify with God; but no man hath seen God at any time for the simple reason that the One embracing the Many cannot be set as One among the Many. The Infinite cannot be set as a super-finite, a further member of the finite series however exalted or different as long as he remains finite, that is, less than the whole. But the point of our argument is that we may read the character and personality of the Infinite, as far as is possible to finite comprehension, by looking at that part of the universe where personality and character come into expression in their most developed forms. We must make use of our doctrine of degrees or values, and recognize that *where character and personality have reached their fullest expression in a world of individualism, limitation and victory over limitation, we have that approximation to the character of God which alone can*

ave meaning for us. The individual cannot manifest omniscience r omnipresence, but he can express love, sympathy, courage, atience, ethical greatness and nobility. Where else could we ealize these than in the finite conditions of manifestation found n our familiar human life?

IV.

They that have seen grace and truth in Jesus Christ have herefore seen the Father. In our reading of the Gospels it is no oncern of ours to stress anything of the nature of physical ab- ormality in Jesus, but to realize his eminence of character and he wealth of his gracious personality. These are the significant eatures for our claim of the manifestation of God in Christ. We ay regard miracles either as psychical accidentals or as the ributes of elaboration to the impression made by ethical pre- minence or appeal. These are features at the circumference : if ve make them central we are blurring and confusing the signifi- ance of Jesus as the manifestation of God in genuinely human erms. The popular stress upon the physically abnormal actually luts at the very heart of real Incarnation. It is not the Jesus born f a virgin, walking upon the sea, turning water into wine, break- ng from a tomb who really manifests such a God as we have been onceiving, but the Jesus who was the courageous prophet of truth, he friend of publicans and sinners, setting his face steadfastly owards Jerusalem,

> And in the Garden secretly,
> And on the Cross on high,
> Should teach his brethren, and inspire
> To suffer and to die.

The instincts of Christendom have been right in finding the signifi- ance of God in Jesus on the Cross, in sacrifice and self-denial, hrough rejection, suffering and death entering into his glory. It s his death and resurrection which gives meaning to Jesus as evealing the Father.

It follows from study that we cannot isolate the manifestation f the personality of God in Jesus from that same manifestation in ther persons showing a like spirit. We may find differences of degree but not of essential nature. This is involved in the state- ment that Jesus is true man as well as true God. Humanity must e humanity in the accepted sense, not a 'second-humanity' or a seeming-humanity.' The terms of manifestation are genuinely uman in the case of Jesus, and any attempt to de-humanize Jesus an only confuse and obscure his real value of revealing the Father. At the same time such attempts may have a *symbolic* alue in indicating the truth of the divine revelation in Jesus,

stated as it were in the language of another philosophy of the universe. They are parabolic rather than scientific. The real issue between traditionalists and modernists is not one of the exalted place assigned to the Master, or of the real revelation of God in Jesus, or of a genuine Incarnation or Atonement; it is a fundamental difference of philosophic background, a radical difference in the conception of the nature of God.

If men set God over against the world of familiar experience, in a remote compartment of the universe, his revelation will correspond to the general conception. It will be a 'theosophy'; the revealer will be a messenger from another world, trailing the clouds of otherworldliness, abnormality, miracle through the alien world in which he temporarily appears. He will be akin to the gods of ancient tradition who descended from the skies, adopting human form but able at any moment to transcend and escape its limitations. Such a conception is held in all Docetic ideas of Christ or in those varieties of theory concerning his nature which seek to combine human and divine as really mutually exclusive essences. All these seem philosophically unsatisfactory and confusing. Nor can it be said that a scientific study of the Gospels, treating them as we should treat other ancient documents, is favourable to such a conception of the Master. We can see there a growing elaboration of a simpler figure — 'most human and yet most divine, the flower of man and God.'

V.

To us the Incarnation is our statement of belief in the divine constitution of the universe; it expresses our conviction that the universe from end to end has a spiritual significance; the deepest spiritual truths which men have rightly seen in Jesus, we find to be the key to all life; in his grace and truth we see the Father, and grace and truth wherever found have in some degree a like significance. The Atonement is a reality. It is a saving work of God's grace in Christ. But it still proceeds in humanity and throws light on the travails of our own time. God to us is no cold Aristotelian deity sitting unmoved, perfect and impassive upon a great White Throne, only affecting the world as a perfect picture may move the hearts of a beholder. Nor do we look for him as an apocalyptic deity coming to cure the sorrows and disorders of the vexed world with a physical omnipotence from without. There is nothing in our realistic experience to encourage such a view. We conceive of God, not mingling in the game as an outsider with the privileges of omnipotence, but 'playing the game' steadily and consistently in human endeavour, sacrifice and slow moral conquest, just as we have conceived him in the life and death of the

aster, suffering and thus entering into his glory. He himself is volved in the whole scheme of earth's struggles, sufferings, forts, tears, overcomings.

We turn again to Pringle-Pattison's idea of 'a God who shares e life of his finite creatures, bearing in and with them the whole rden of their finitude, their sinful wanderings and sorrows and fferings, without which they cannot be made perfect. He is the ternal Redeemer of the world. . . . The divine omnipotence consts in the all-compelling power of goodness and love to enlighten e grossest darkness and to melt the hardest heart' (p. 412). The escription of Christ as Redeemer is true; it is true also of the od incarnated in all ages, and of those who fill up on their part at which is lacking in the afflictions of the historical Jesus even nto the end of time. The works of the incarnated God are prosses, not isolated acts.

> 'Then must it mean not only that Thy sorrow
> Smote Thee that once upon the lonely tree;
> But that to-day, to-night and on the morrow
> Still it will come, O gallant God, to Thee.'
>
> (STUDDERT KENNEDY.)

t the conclusion of the negro play, 'Green Pastures,' Gabriel is aiting to blow the horn to destroy an evil earth by the omnipotent hysical might of God. And God restrains his archangel.

> 'I have been thinking,' he says; 'it may be that even God himself must suffer.' Dramatically a voice is heard in the distance: 'Oh, look at him! Oh look, dey goin' to make him carry it up dat high hill! Dey goin' to nail him to it! O dat's a terrible burden for one man to carry!'

God must suffer to redeem the world. That is still his method. nd he who has eyes to see may still behold the incarnated God imbing the Calvaries of the world, and making the Cross his hrone.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A FEARLESS HISTORIAN*

Fourscore Years, by G. G. Coulton, is a remarkable autobiography by a markable man. The author retains even at the age of eighty his zest for e, his love of new experience, and his forward look. Dr. Coulton was writing is book in the spring of 1942, when the war news was consistently bad. t his faith remained unshaken

> 'that *homo sapiens* is, on the whole, an improving animal, and History has seemed to confirm this probability.' 'Man is not a fallen angel; the facts concordant with saner faith tell us that we have struggled painfully upwards, and exhort us to struggle still' (p. 350). 'Thus Clough comes into my mind: "It fortifies my soul to know that, though I perish, Truth is so."' Democracy will win in the end, whether or not in my lifetime' (p. viii).

* *Fourscore Years,* by G. G. Coulton. (O.U.P. 1943. 21/-.)

In his opening chapters Dr. Coulton gives delightful pictures, first of life in the fine old town of King's Lynn, where his father was a solicitor and local Liberal agent, and later at Pentney in the Norfolk 'holy land,' where the family moved when his father bought a small farm there. The story of his school-days at Felsted follows, and undergraduate days at Cambridge, and comparisons between Cambridge now and sixty years ago. At Cambridge Dr. Coulton had the misfortune to fall ill just before his finals, compelling him to take an *aegrotat* degree. This was a disaster for one who was going to earn his living by teaching, and for most of the next thirty years he was assistant master at various smaller and larger schools, concluding with thirteen years at a famous cramming school. During this time he made many most interesting friends, among them W. H. Fowler and H. Rashdall. He writes of these friendships with frankness and generosity. He is shrewd and simple, direct and honest.

> 'Aiming at frankness for myself, I have used the same freedom, or even more, human nature being what it is, about others. . . . I hope for general agreement that in proportion as a man is really great, he can afford the truth, alive or dead, and with the better part of his nature would have welcomed such truth' (p. viii).

A charming chapter describes his courtship and engagement when he was 43.

During these years he was gradually feeling his way towards the work to which he has given his best powers, the study of medieval history, particularly religious history. It is now thirty years since I was first introduced to two of his books, *The Medieval Garner*, a delightful collection of extracts from contemporary documents illustrating many phases of medieval life, and his edition of the thirteenth century chronicle of the Franciscan Salimbene, published under the title *From St. Francis to Dante*. The recognition which he has won in the intervening years has been rather grudgingly given. He has been handicapped partly because the popular taste for Gothic architecture has inclined people to sentimentalize over medieval religion. Anglo-Catholics again imagine the Middle Ages as a golden age when the Catholic Church was all that they wish it to be now and know it is not. Roman Catholic writers have special reasons for partiality and insincerity, for Pope Leo XIII had written to the clergy of France in 1899:

> 'Those who study (History) must never lose sight of the fact that it contains a collection of dogmatic facts which impose themselves upon our faith, and which no man is permitted to call in question' (p. 330).

One great contribution which Dr. Coulton has made to the study of Medieval History has been that he has drawn attention to a great mass of contemporary documents which were at the time ignored or even unknown. His great work, *Five Centuries of Religion,* is crammed with quotations from original sources. In a chapter of his autobiography he reflects upon historical study.

> '"History is experience." . . . In history, as elsewhere, our first guide should be common-sense. . . . Common-sense prompts the real truth-seeker to use all his powers of observation and imagination. Without having read Bishop Butler, each knows that Probability is the Guide of life, and each throws all his energies into the search for probabilities. All discussions and theories are mischievous which by representing Historical Method as something esoteric tend to obscure this truth. The more we divorce History from the common life of ordinary men, the more we strangle its own vigorous life' (p. 318).

His second principle concerns judgment in history.

> 'While trying to see both sides, I have striven also to face questions

of good and evil, and to express in those matters my own experience, that is my personal reaction to what I seem to find in the records. As against critics who exaggerate in the other direction, telling us that the historian who judges ceases at that point to be a historian at all, I am all the more impenitent, because I have never met anyone who really practised that precept. In its mildest form it runs, "The Historian's business is not to judge but to understand." But this is meaningless; for judge and understand, so far from being exclusive contradictories, are in fact complementary ideas. How can we understand anything without taking pains to judge it?' (p. 320).

A quotation from Lord Acton follows:

'I exhort you never to debase the moral currency or to lower the standard of rectitude, but to try others by the final maxim that governs your own life, and to suffer no man and no cause to escape the undying penalty which history has the power to inflict upon wrong' (p. 323).

r. Coulton is convinced that history should be not impartial but judicial.

'Why should not the most scientific historian content himself with Goethe's confession of faith, "I can promise to be sincere but not to be impartial"?' (p. 324).

nd lastly, the question of controversy in History.

'I entered upon my more solid volumes with a consciousness of the self-taught man's limitations. But I also saw that the field which interested me most was one which offered, side by side with new truths, an abundant crop of inveterate errors. Therefore from the first, I employed destructive criticism for clearing the way to my constructive work' (p. 325). 'What History needs is not less, but more controversy. A stricter public attitude might raise the standard of factual truth among historians to something which should at least approach that of our law-courts. We want not less quantity of controversy, but far better quality' (p. 326).

Dr. Coulton's thirty years of controversy with Cardinal Gasquet lie behind hese reflexions. A chapter is given to the story, which will surprise anyone ho has not experienced at first hand the subterfuges and dishonesties of oman Catholic controversialists. The English public dislikes controversy, articularly religious controversy. We like to think well of other people, specially if thinking badly demands taking active measures against the harm ney threaten us. Professor E. L. Woodward in *Short Journey* gives an in-tance in his last chapter; his own failure to prevent the English public in ie years 1933-1939 from falling into the trap of German propaganda, whose urpose was to persuade us that Germany was not chiefly responsible for the ar of 1914, so as under this smoke-screen of innocence to prepare for the ar of 1939. At first, Cardinal Gasquet seems to have tried to silence Dr. oulton by ignoring him. But he is not easily silenced. He is a very persist-nt man. His insistence on accuracy in the smallest details and his reiterated orrection of opponents who fall below his own high standard proves tedious t times even to sympathetic readers. Rashdall once told him that he ex-iatiated too much. The word 'barrator' comes to one's mind, which the xford Dictionary defines, 'One who vexatiously raises or invites litigation; ence barratous, quarrelsome.' Dr. Coulton is a Norfolk man, and 'Norfolk arrators' were well known in the Middle Ages. Samson, a monk in the reat monastery of St. Edmundsbury, was also a Norfolk man. When a new bbot was to be appointed some of the monks prayed, 'From good clerks, ood Lord, deliver us; that it may please Thee to preserve us from the arrators of Norfolk, we beseech Thee to hear us, Good Lord.' This prayer,

however, was not granted. Samson became abbot, and the greatest ruler of that famous monastery.

Dr. Coulton, a Norfolk man, has been a very pertinacious controversialist; but the cause is not quarrelsomeness. He is simple, straightforward, with a passionate love of truth, and a tireless curiosity. These qualities have enabled him to make the most valuable contributions to our knowledge of the Middle Ages. 'The first factor in the successful search for truth is the real desire to arrive at the truth; seek and ye shall find' (p. 318).

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

DON, DISSENTER AND DEARLY BELOVED

Bernard Lord Manning (born 1892, died 1941) well deserves to be commemorated; and the publication of four volumes* — comprising a memoir, essays, two volumes of sermons — constitutes a fitting memorial which will not only be highly appreciated by his personal friends and acquaintances, but also by readers who can find, in the by-ways of life and in the study of human personality and its development and influence, a recreation in the truest sense of that word.

B. L. Manning was the son of a Congregational minister. His father and mother were originally Methodists, but found a more congenial environment less emotional and further removed from the Church of England than Methodism. The Methodist has invariably a sense of relationship to the Church of England, but the Congregationalist a sense of separateness. B. L. Manning's father was an exemplary Christian pastor, and he evoked the deepest reverence and warmest affection from his son.

As life brought B. L. Manning into close contact with other Christian Churches more historic, more magnificent, more aesthetic than Congregationalism, his reverence for his father's religion in its purity, simplicity, disinterestedness and sincerity, held him loyal to his father's denomination. There was a quality in his father's religion which might be equalled in some cases in other denominations but which was never surpassed. All his life Manning felt that Congregationalism had a contribution to make to the religious life of the English people which no other denomination was able to make and by the extinction of which our national religious life would be the poorer. Manning was not a Dissenter simply by the accident of birth and environment: he was a Dissenter on principle. He recognized the necessity for dissent, and he valued it highly when that dissent realized not only the need for its existence, but expressed itself in the most uncompromising, clear-headed and positive manner. He hated flabbiness in religion: he hated the confusing of ideas: he hated easy-going opportunism and condescending tolerance: he was a Dissenter of Dissenters. On the other hand, he had the deepest reverence for the Christian Religion wherever he found it, whether in the Romanism of Father Hugh Benson, or in the Anglo-Catholicism of Father Ignatius, or in the simple Evangelicalism of the folk of the Yorkshire dales.

When he came up to Cambridge from an unknown country school in 1912 he was admitted to a major scholarship in Jesus College, and devoted himself thereafter to the study of modern history. His intellectual development was remarkable, and he became Fellow, Bursar, and finally Senior Tutor. Although his health through all this period was far from good, he entered in a wonderful way into the life of his College, and even into the larger life of his University. He died in 1941 at the age of 49.

* *Essays in Orthodox Dissent.* 1939, reprinted 1943. 6/-.
A Layman in the Ministry, Sermons and Addresses. 1942. 6/-.
More Sermons of a Layman, by Bernard Lord Manning, M.A. (Independent Press. 1944. 6/-.)
Bernard Lord Manning, A Memoir, by F. Brittain, M.A. (Heffer. 1944. 7/6.)

Notwithstanding the exacting demands which his academic life made on s far from robust constitution, he devoted much of his time and energy to e discharge of his religious duties, and was an ardent lay preacher in Con-egational churches and a most popular and arresting speaker at Free Church nferences. No student of Dissent in this country can afford to neglect read-g his volume of brilliant and independent *Essays in Othodox Dissent.* nglish Churchmen will perhaps be most interested in his essay 'A Free nurchman's view of the Established Church.' The depth and breadth of his sight and sympathy may be judged from the concluding paragraph of this say:

> 'Finally, if the Commission asks me, Do you personally wish to see the episcopal Church disestablished? I can only answer, "I do not know," though I know that most Free Churchmen would not hesitate for a moment. Personally I am torn both ways. Taught by John Calvin of what is due to the Church, I could not myself belong to the Church of England as by law established, any more than I could belong to the Conservative Party or to the Labour Party. But I am not as sorry as I ought to be that other people have what seem to be less instructed consciences. Many Free Churchmen have no feeling for the Church of England as a national institution, though they cherish it as a part of Christ's Church; but not a few Free Churchmen, like myself (and I suspect we who feel so are countrybred Free Churchmen), have a tender regard for the Church of England as it now stands as a national institution, while we shrink with horror from the thought of its being turned into a disestablished, self-governing episcopalian sect.'

Manning's two volumes of sermons provide models of what country ser-ons ought to be. They are so fresh, so plain, so moving, so essentially riptural, that both educated and uneducated people must have listened to em with attention and gratitude. Some, however, will be disappointed. hese sermons show no knowledge of Biblical Criticism. They make no emands for social reform. They utter no slogans and boost no stunts. Per-aps his sermon 'The Religion of all sensible men and the Religion of hristians' is the most characteristic in these two volumes.

Manning was a very sensible man, but for him the Christian Religion was ore than a religion of good sense. His Calvinism and his Evangelicalism ade it more profound and more tender.

striking article by him on 'Why did the Lollards fail?' was published in e *Modern Churchman* of May, 1916 (Vol. VI, p. 71). H.D.A.M.

RUSSIAN CHRISTIANITY AND THE FUTURE *

The substance of this striking book was delivered as lectures in Oxford d London to the Schools of Slavonic Languages in 1942. Its purpose is to terpret the Russian Orthodox Church. For centuries this Church, like Rus-a herself, was cut off from contact with the rest of Christendom. Like ussia it was also largely inarticulate, without a literature or theology. But hen, under the inspiration of Western ideas, Russian literature suddenly irst into full flower in the nineteenth century, the Church found few spokes-en to explain or defend her. Russian writers belonged to the upper classes ho

> 'were carried away by the powerful stream of foreign life, and lost contact with their own homeland' (p. 45). 'These Russians disdainfully dissociated themselves from their cultural past, began to imitate the latest movements of European thought and manners, declaring that their own nation had never been able to make any contribution to the civilization of

* *Three Russian Prophets,* by Nicolas Zernov. (S.C.M. 8/6. 1944.)

mankind. This attitude, however, was taken only by a minority of the Russians, the bulk of the people, merchants, clergy and peasants remained faithful to their traditional outlook' (p. 46).

A footnote follows:

'Russia differs from the West in that her culture is represented mostly by her lower classes, especially the peasants. Its essentially artistic foundation makes possible even to the illiterate a full participation in it. The upper classes, however, owing to the abandonment of religion, were often most ignorant of their own cultural inheritance, and they were responsible for giving the impression to the West, that the majority of their people were ignorant and uncultured, an idea widespread in Europe to the present day' (p. 46).

This Russian culture was like Chinese culture, where the mass of the people are also illiterate, a way of life in which the entire nation shared. But whereas Chinese culture has at its foundation a moral code, Russian culture was based on the Christian religion, and its expression was in the Holy Eucharist of the Russian Church.

'It was the belief that the Russians are one big family and the realization that this unity depends neither on the compulsion exercised by the ruler, nor on the legal system imposed upon them, but rests on their willing obedience to the same rhythm of life . . . The people act as one body on the strength of their moral solidarity' (p. 30).

The inspiration of this culture was the liturgical services of the Orthodox Church, especially the Holy Eucharist.

'Lacking legal training, inarticulate in speech, backward in science, the Russians became masters in the conduct of worship, and their entire culture was built around the celebration of the Divine Offices. The parish church was for the Russians their school, their concert-room, their picture gallery — all that the nation possessed that was creative in thought or art found its expression in the worship of the Church. The Eastern Orthodox Eucharist is a piece of perfectly dramatised action. It contains the whole story of the Incarnation.

'The most remarkable feature of this service is its corporate nature. The priest is little heard and often remains unseen behind the solid screen. It is not he who celebrates for the laity as is the case in the West. In the East the Eucharist is conducted by the joint action of priest, deacon, choir and people, who all have their well-defined parts to play and are equally indispensable to the service. The rite is both solemn and homely; all its movements are fixed, and yet its performance is spontaneous and free. The symbolism is so well-balanced that it is both profound and simple, and can be understood by learned and simple alike' (p. 30).

The Russian *intelligentsia*, which in the nineteenth century was largely agnostic, and foreign visitors to Russia were alike impressed by the beauty and solemnity of the Russian Liturgy, particularly on the great festivals such as Easter. But because they were not believing members of the Church, they could only see it from the outside; they could not understand what it meant to the peasantry. That could be understood only by those who acted in it and believed it, and because they were mostly illiterate and uneducated they could not put its meaning into words.

'But men, women and children acted for generations in this religious drama, and derived from it a Christian philosophy of life which permeated their whole existence. The outlook which was contained in these services implied belief in man's unique value and in his freedom. For though made of dust, infected with sin and condemned to pain and

sorrow, he was so treasured by his Creator that God Himself became Man. A Russian knew that his present state of degradation was only temporary, that he was created in the image of God, and that he was called to take an active part in the transfiguration and redemption of the universe. The purpose of human life was conceived as approximation to the Divine prototype' (p. 32).

'The great achievement of Russian culture was a deep understanding of man, and the longing for a righteous social order' (p. 32).

'The road to the ultimate goal was the same for every Christian; it was summarised for the Russians in the Beatitudes. The Western social and political order has been built on the idea of law; the Ten Commandments, the Roman ideal of law and the notion of privilege were the three solid pillars which supported the inspiring edifice of European civilisation. But the Russians were brought up in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. They listened for centuries at every Eucharist to the words of this most challenging, most paradoxical definition of the purpose of human life, and of the means of achieving perfection. A Russian might be a good man, or a bad man, he might try to apply its teaching to his life, or act contrary to its precepts, but he had no doubt that this was the final revelation of truth, and that there was no other path to bring man to life and happiness. The Russians often failed to show those virtues which were particularly valued by Western Christians, but their great moral achievements were their readiness to forgive offenders, their genuine humility and charity and, above all, their understanding of the mutual responsibility of all. They believed in God's mercy for sinners, they trusted in man's ability to distinguish between good and evil, and considered that healthy social life was the condition of moral growth for the individual. They were convinced that the ideal of the Christian family with its atmosphere of mutual help, love and freedom was God's intended pattern for the Christian social order, and felt confident in spite of frailty and sin that it was a realizeable plan. The Russians of Moscow had no confidence in human justice, but firmly trusted in Divine guidance, and knew that the Holy Spirit, the only source of life and truth, spoke through the free and unanimous voice of the assembled people. It did not matter whether they had or had not political rights or economic freedom; they all as Christians could hear the voice of God and act according to His commandment' (p. 33).

This is Professor Zernov's preliminary sketch of the Russian Church. He illustrates it from three Russian authors, Khomiakov, Dostoevsky and Soloviev, of whom only Dostoevsky is much read in this country. These three, unlike their Russian literary contemporaries, remained members of the Church and could understand it. Their contemporaries had so thoroughly accepted European ideas that they had cut themselves off from their national culture and their own people. In particular they could not understand the Russian peasant. But Dostoevsky learnt to understand him in the four years he spent in prison in Siberia. He wrote:

'The Russian people know Christ in their hearts, and possess His true image. It has been handed down to them from one generation to another, and now is deeply implanted in their hearts. It is possible that Christ is the only true love of the Russian nation, and they love Him in their own typical way; they love Him and suffer because of their sins' (p. 105).

Professor Zernov comments as follows:

'Dostoevsky learnt to respect Russian peasants, to admire their deep sense of justice and, above all, their sound scale of values. Many of those

he met in Siberia were morally sick people, but they knew good and evil and had a clear idea what Christ meant to the individual and to mankind' (p. 105).

This was the Russian Church in its heigh-day and as it continued with lessening influence till the Revolution.[1] What of it now and in the future? Mr. Hindus in his latest book *Mother Russia* (1943) has written, 'The Russian *Moujik* is dead.' The makers of the Revolution belonged to the minority of Westernised Russians. They had absorbed the essentially Western philosophy of Karl Marx. They were atheists. At the same time they retained the Russian faith that man is able to transform and redeem the world. Russian Communists believe in a realizeable Utopia, but unlike the Russian Orthodox, it is a Utopia without God. What place if any is the Russian Church likely to have in the new State? The best Russian singers were formerly members of church choirs. They are now members of great factory choirs. Formerly it was the Liturgy which was the fine flower of Russian culture. To-day it is the performances at the State theatres. The State has recently made a *concordat* with the Church. The Church is tolerated. But the official creed of Russian Communism is still atheism; and the Communist Party rules Russia. Before the Revolution there were two hundred churches in Moscow; now there are twenty, and these are only full at the great festivals. But in the intervening years the population has more than doubled. A strong support of the Church at present is said to be the grannies, who have charge of the children while their fathers are at the front and their mothers in war factories.

'The Russian *Moujik*, the pre-revolution peasant, is dead.' What does the present Russian generation think of the Church? It seems that to the vast majority the Church is just irrelevant, a survival from the past. But the Russians of to-day have rediscovered the greatness of their nineteenth-century literature, which only a few years ago was called anti-communist, bourgeois and worthless. Perhaps in time Russians will rediscover the greatness of their Church, which is so typically Russian in its strength and weakness.

J. K. Nettlefold.

'I AM NOT MAD, MOST NOBLE FESTUS'*

Mr. Symes-Thompson attempts in this small book and its predecessors to get young people on to the path leading towards religious enlightenment, or to build a bridge between youth and the unseen. The fact that our young people stand at such very different levels of education and general culture makes it very difficult to devise any scheme that will be equally effective with all. Some of them come from cultured and religious homes, where serious subjects are treated seriously and there is an atmosphere of intellectual sincerity and moral and social idealism. Others come from homes where a book is never opened, and where the radio is never turned off. Mr. Symes-Thompson seems to us to cater rather for those who have enjoyed educational and cultural advantages rather above the average, for he quotes in Latin, French and Portuguese.

'Most people to-day,' he writes, 'are too rushed to study deep things; but if you are a night fire-watcher don't be content with mere novels. You might get hold of translations of Aristotle, Plotinus, Dionysius,

[1] An anonymous little book, *The Way of a Pilgrim* (S.P.C.K. 6/-. 1941), gives an authentic picture of what the Russian Church meant in the first half of the nineteenth century to one Russian peasant who was quite untouched by Western ideas. Its chief value for us is that here the usually inarticulate Russian peasant speaks directly to us.

* *Bridgebuilding*. Part VII. By F. Symes-Thompson, M.A., with a foreword by Archdeacon Lonsdale Ragg, D.D. (Published by Billing & Sons Ltd., Guildford. To be obtained from Messrs. A. R. Mowbray Ltd. 1/6. 1943.)

Hegel, Kant, Descartes, and you might read books by Dostoievski, Berdyaev, Kierkegaard, Evelyn Underhill, Dean Inge, and, using your freedom as Christians, you could balance it all up and live in personal mental clarity.'

Mr. Symes-Thompson feels, no doubt justifiably, that our Anglican system does not attempt systematically enough to secure advance from one stage to another in the spiritual life; and he has been impressed by the Mithraic system with its seven grades, and aims at introducing something of the sort into his 'bridgebuilding.'

'Our system, alas, is not able to maintain keenness in the laity. Steady advance after Confirmation is necessary; the opposite so often happens. If a system similar to Bridge-building could be planned as an essential part of the Youth Movement, definite advance would be made.'

It is interesting to note that Mr. Symes-Thompson attaches great importance to 'speech-rhythm.' Indeed, the whole subject of rhythm of sound and movement in relation to the emotions is very important, and has perhaps not been sufficiently studied. One wonders what the results would have been if the Church had allowed music to become entirely secularized, as it has allowed dancing to become. In primitive times, and even later, dancing was an important part of religious ceremonial, and the psychological reasons for this are no doubt deep-seated.

There can be no doubt that a far larger number of quite young people, even children, possess a marked mystical faculty as well as an interest in metaphysical questions, than is usually supposed. The conditions of modern life tend to suppress all this as unprofitable in the struggle to get equipped for material success.

To some Mr. Symes-Thompson's manual may seem not sufficiently systematic and perhaps too diffuse. But young people to-day are so inured to textbooks and rather arid schemes of instruction, now that education has become so lamentably efficient, that they may be attracted by a book with instruction and advice which they can take in self-appointed doses. They will find much that is profitable here, *e.g.* some good prayers, instructions where to find others, an introduction to the literature of mysticism, as well as much encouragement to persevere in the spiritual life. One great merit the book has, it is commendably free from slush, and also from the somewhat sentimental type of ecclesiastical sacramentalism which some clergy consider helpful for the young. Nor does Mr. Symes-Thompson assume, as do so many celibate clergy, that the primary, and even sole, interest of the young is sex. It may be that Mr. Symes-Thompson, if successful, would be producing in our midst a new breed of Quietists; in which case we hope he will not suffer the fate of Molinos. For the trouble with Quietists is that they have tended to attach only minor importance to some things which the clergy place in the foreground. There are certain spiritual vested interests which would be threatened by any large-scale revival of Quietism. There are some, perhaps, who would almost prefer the present predominance of Secularism.

J.C.H.

CHARACTER-BUILDING IN WAR-TIME*

The preparation and delivery of school sermons can be no simple task in view of the kind of audience before which they are delivered. Those who listen to school sermons are probably above the average in information and intelligence, some of them may even be more or less sophisticated. Yet they

* *To the School at War.* By the Rev. H. K. Luce, B.D., with a foreword by the Very Rev. C. A. Alington, D.D. (Cambridge University Press. Price 3/-, post free. Copies obtainable from the Headmaster, School House, Durham. Profits to Durham School War Memorial Fund.)

are as yet without experience of those sides of life which more than others impel men to have recourse to religion as a source of inner strength, *i.e.* suffering, death, grave anxieties and responsibilities, and so on. Perhaps this is why the more sensitive among public schoolboys tend to turn to art rather than to religion, just as the less sensitive turn to politics, and the least sensitive to sport. Another feature of this type of audience which makes it 'difficult' is that it is not, as the average congregation largely is, a collection of separated individuals, but a closely-knit community professing (and what is more) *practising* a traditional and binding code of tribal ethics enforced by strict sanctions. This accepted code may not at all points coincide with that which the Christian preacher is striving to inculcate. The tribal ethic has its good points, but it is precisely these which make adherence to it a very effective form of inoculation against the undiluted ethic of Christ. The preacher must often feel that he is up against a pretty solid defence line, and perhaps the tactics of infiltration are more promising than those of frontal attack.

But Canon Luce has not been a headmaster for nothing, and well understands the soil into which he casts his good seed. It must be a temptation for school preachers to take over the tribal ethic and to dispense it with a little Christian seasoning, knowing that it will be accepted, and not knowing that the seasoning will be filtered out. And it must be a temptation also to stress the ethic and to let ideas and beliefs go by the board, or at least to allot them a position of minor importance. Does not the Public School claim to stress 'character' rather than 'intellect'? Canon Luce does not fall into either of these booby-traps. As examples of his insistence on the need for an intellectual background, we may take two passages:

> 'If we are to be happy, we need a moral and spiritual life-line — a philosophy of living — a definite ideal to guide and discipline and dominate our lives. And we can only find this in religion — in the sense of meaning and purpose for our lives which comes from God, who is the Source and End of our being' (p. 71).

In another sermon, entitled 'Truth,' Canon Luce speaks, amongst other things, of 'truth of feeling':

> 'Lastly, and deepest of all, truth of feeling — by this I mean that inner certainty by which we know, whatever other people may say, what is right and good and most worth striving for. It is these deep feelings which form the motives of our actions and the guidance of our lives. We cannot test them in the laboratory, or prove them by reasoning. They are matters of faith, which cannot be proved by argument but only verified by action — faith in the best in ourselves and others, and faith in what we know of God and His purposes and standards through Jesus Christ. This, for most of us who are not philosophers, is the inner citadel of truth itself — that part of our living in which we feel most clearly in harmony with the mysterious power which directs and shapes our existence and its destiny' (p. 22).

The points to notice here are two, namely, (1) that the type of belief insisted on is not detailed and dogmatic, and (2) that the fundamental beliefs have their foundations sunk in psychological strata which lie deeper than reason. This is not, of course, to depreciate reason. For example, 'the will to live' lies deeper than reason, but reason can confirm it. The trouble with our generation is that the *foundations* of our earth 'are out of course,' so that, inevitably, we 'will not be learned nor understand, but walk on still in darkness.' If the rational levels only were disturbed, it would not so much matter; but the dislocations are far deeper, and proper adjustments have not yet been made, and perhaps cannot be for a long time to come.

But the background of beliefs and the foundation for values being thus utlined, it is natural that the major part of the content of these sermons ould be ethical. But there is nothing here of the legalistic, abstract, dry oralising which would little profit these young hearers; on the contrary ere is much of that practical wisdom which only experience of life can give, d one truth of which only experience of life can fully establish. For example rom a sermon preached at the end of the school year):

> 'It is not wise to let our emotions play too much upon the past — that may make us less able to make the best of the future; and it is not really right to shrink from change. We should hold ourselves ready to face without hesitation the challenge of change — the challenge to our character and capacities which new circumstances present. For it is by the testing power of new tasks and new opportunities that the true metal of our best selves will be forged' (p. 12).

> 'When have you been most happy during the time you have been at school here? When life has gone well for you, when things have been easy, you have felt the pleasure of success; you have enjoyed, in moments of leisure, physical ease, mental pleasures, the happiness of good fellowship . . . But have there not been times of a greater happiness still? Have not difficulties conquered, disappointments overcome, temptations mastered, the best that you have to give given freely . . . have not these things brought you the greatest happiness of all? Has it not been at times like these that you have been most sure that you are doing what you have been put into the world to do, have you not felt that mysterious, yet unmistakably real sense of being in complete harmony with the universe of which you are part? I am sure that you will agree that this is so' (p. 13).

> 'The lesson for each one of us is that the greatest task he has is the building up of his own character. Not selfishly, or priggishly, of course — not in order to avoid misfortune, or to win praise; but unselfishly and unostentatiously, remembering that the only true test of the value of a man's life is what he gives and not what he gets. The greatest gift you can give to the world is your own character, if it is unselfish and honest and brave. Consciously or unconsciously you are working at this task of character-building every moment of every day' (p. 25).

Three sermons in this collection deal with the relations of Science and Religion. The first deals historically with the conflict between them; the second with some recent developments in science; the third with the future relations between them. Canon Luce summarises the results of recent changes of outlook as follows:

> 'Scientists now realise that there are very definite limits to the knowledge which science can achieve. Science now realises that its observations — or laws — are only partial statements of the truth: and science does not claim to be able to explain the real nature of the universe and everything in it. You can see at once that this makes a great difference to the Scientist's attitude towards religion. The scientist is now ready to admit that there are other roads to truth besides his own road, and the methods of religion, as well as the methods of science, are needed in the search for truth, and that the knowledge of the universe which religion can achieve has as much claim to be regarded as true as the knowledge given by science.'

A sermon on Thomas Arnold, preached in commemoration of the centenary of his death, is an admirable example of the kind of biographical discourse which can be so profitable and so interesting.

Another sermon, entitled 'The Generous-hearted,' preached from the text, 'Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God,' is in memory of a former member of the school who, at the age of twenty-three, was posted missing presumed killed after a raid on Hamburg. He would seem to have been a singularly gifted and attractive character:

> 'He had Irish blood in him, and a keen sense of humour . . . He was very even-tempered, and gentle by nature — so that on first acquaintance he seemed rather easy-going; but those who presumed on that soon found out their mistake, for his standards of personal conduct and duty were very high . . . His affectionate nature made him many friends and few enemies . . . Above all he was absolutely straight-forward and genuine — I have never trusted any boy more implicitly — and there was a certain "fineness" in his character which was above everything second-rate and mean.'

The present collection of sermons is dedicated to this boy, who would serve, no doubt, as an example of the type of character that they are designed to foster. That they may have helped to bring forth such fruit must be the desire of all who read them, no less than of him who delivered them.

J.C.H.

'WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST'*

Anything coming from the pen of so accomplished a scholar as Dr. Manson claims the closest attention, and the Cunningham Lectures of 1940 are a valuable contribution to theological literature. Much attention is devoted to Form Criticism, and the conclusion of Dr. Manson, and rightly so, is that we have a far more reliable account of the words and actions of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels than that school will allow. Form Criticism is far less reliable than Source Criticism. The latter is scientific, and we can attain practically sure results: the former is largely working from intuition, it can reach no certain conclusions, and is to be used with extreme caution. It has contributed much valuable help to our understanding of Jesus, and we can never again be so absolutely certain that we have His words exactly as He spoke them, the assumption that passed in less critical days.

We have, however, to allow for the conscious attempts of the Church to stress His words to suit their contemporary needs, and to allow for certain theological assumptions and religious tendencies, but as Dr. Manson tells us:

> 'Is it not possible to regard the modification which the Mark-material has undergone at the hands of the redactors Matthew and Luke as giving us the key to the kind of development through which the tradition of the acts and words of Jesus passed in the earlier oral period as giving us in fact a measured baseline from which to calculate the whole trend of tradition-history?' (p. 23).

It is true, as he points out, that 'we come back in the end to the position that we see Jesus only through the tradition of the Church' (p. 32), and there is a lot of work to be done in rightly understanding and weighing up this tradition.

In Chapter VI, dealing with 'The Messianic Categories in the Tradition,' Dr. Manson makes out a strong case for his conclusion that 'Son of God,' 'Son of Man' and 'Servant of the Lord' are really interchangeable titles. Hence much fine-spun criticism on the subject can be safely disregarded. As Dr. Manson says, 'hampered and embarrassed the Synoptic Christology undoubtedly is' (p. 96).

Dr. Manson examines the theory of Dr. Otto in his book, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man,* in which that author argues that the *Book of Enoch* had much influence in shaping the conceptions of Jesus as to His Messiahship.

* *Jesus the Messiah,* by William Manson, D.D. (Hodder and Stoughton. 1943. 8/6.)

Dr. Manson is of the opinion that Dr. Otto's conclusion cannot be sustained. He says:

> 'It would be unwise to make use of this supposed dependence of the mind of Jesus on the Enoch-literature. In Otto's book the theory is carried to an inordinate length' (p. 76).

In an appendix Dr. Manson tabulates a number of Old Testament passages which show the 'Interconnection of the Concepts Davidic Messiah, Servant of the Lord, and Heavenly Son of Man.'

There is some good criticism of the institution of the Lord's Supper in the chapter 'The Passion and Death of the Messiah.' Dr. Manson says:

> 'We seem, then, to be left with two rival traditions as to the form of the institution, *Mk.* xiv, 22-25, and *Lk.* xxii, 17-19. Can we determine to which of these oldest traditions the historical priority is to be assigned? The question is difficult because we do not know all the circumstances under which these two primary types were evolved. In other words, we do not know the precise relation of either tradition to history. Conceptual motives of the kind which Form Criticism stresses have been appealed to, and may have played a part in the shaping of both narratives' (p. 137).

The 'Epilogue: Jesus Messiah' is theological rather than critical, and is of the greatest value for students of Christology, especially in its sub-sections, 'Eternal Nature of our Religious Dependence on Jesus' and 'The Transvaluation of Christianity.' Dr. Manson well says: 'Jesus has transmuted the language used by Judaism in its doctrine of the last things. It is not a case of the human personality of Jesus being swallowed up in a Messianic conception, but of all Messianic conceptions being absorbed into the sphere of his spirit.' In the last sub-section, 'The Fullness of Sacrifice,' we have the following notable words:

> 'And here also the eternal nature of the dependence of our souls on Jesus comes to final expression. We saw how the encounter of our souls with Jesus in his revelation of the will of God brings us to a point where, if the truth which he declares is accepted, it leaves us waiting on him for the next word, and for all the words of life. It is now seen into what ultimate character of life this waiting upon Jesus leads us. It is into an existence conditioned by trust in, and determined by gratitude towards one in whom, as nowhere else, the redeeming love of God towards sinful man has actualized itself in a way which meets our need. "The life which I now live in the flesh," so runs one of the most classical of statements of the conception, "I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me." In such an orientation of life the Christian soul has never any doubt of being in contact with eternal spirit and of being reconciled with God.'

There is an appendix on 'The Heavenly Man Redemption Myth.' It treats the diffused Oriental belief in a Primal or Heavenly Man which Reitzenstein considers to have been developed both in a cosmological and in a soteriological direction, and which he takes back to a root in the Zoroastrian myth of Gayomart, the first man.

But in summing up Dr. Manson says 'that if ideas of Iranian *provenance*, coming into Judaism with the conception of the Son of Man, obtained a foothold in Rabbinical circles and were there employed, with or without a consciousness of their source, for the speculative development of the manner of Daniel's vision, so it is not at all improbable that they would be known to St. Paul, and would contribute features to the schematization of ideas in his doctrine of the person and work of Christ.'

Dr. Manson certainly writes for serious students of theology, but he can be appreciated also by plain men.

S. H. N. Pilcher.

A TRACT FOR THE TIMES

Dr. Major's little book*—little only in quantity but great in the quality of its thought and spirit—is a very timely and urgent restatement of an appeal which has been made with power but all too rarely in the past generation. It is timely because the acceptance of a basic and unifying religion is an indispensable preliminary to any permanent peace-making: it is urgent because such a preliminary can only be attained if it is honestly, generally and speedily decided upon. *Basic Christianity* by its brevity and sincerity, not less than by the plan and character of its contents, will compel all those into whose hands it comes to face the issues that it raises.

With its first three chapters there will be widespread agreement. When twenty years ago the late Professor Bowman was insisting that all our efforts for a League of Nations and for universal peace were conditional upon our agreement as to what constituted the good life for man, and that this involved a searching examination of religion and religions, he was saying what recent events have made explicit and obvious. Nor can there be much doubt that Christianity is the only serious claimant for recognition as the religion of mankind, and yet that in its present multiform and Westernized shapes it cannot make good its claim. Hence the need for a 'basic' version that shall enable mankind to enter into its community without being compelled as a preliminary to accept all its developed secondary and peripheral elements. The parallel with 'basic English' is one that it is vital to Dr. Major's purpose to bear in mind. The present reviewer thinks that Dr. Major would have strengthened his case if he had followed the parallel more closely. It would have checked the tendency of the hasty reader to interpret Dr. Major as implying that if 'basic' comes into use all else must be abandoned. This is not Dr. Major's view. He is not here concerned with the problem of the final form of the Christian Religion, or whether there can be only one true final form, or various final forms. His theme is concerned not with the final form but with the primary form in which the Christian Religion should be presented for acceptance to the masses of mankind who at present are indifferent to its claims or hostile to them.

If it is clearly borne in mind that basic Christianity, though including the essentials, is not intended to relegate all else to the rubbish-heap—and heaven forbid that Mr. Ogden's ingenious lingo should debar us from the language of Shakespeare and Milton—Dr. Major's next chapters will be given a fairer hearing. He claims that basic Christianity is to be found in the teaching of Jesus Himself—in the proclamation of the Kingdom of God, in the seven Beatitudes as defining the character of the Kingdom, in the two Commandments of Jesus as its rule of life, in the Lord's Prayer as its Creed. These four points are set out clearly and convincingly in Chapter v, and form the core of the book. Many of us will remember that in effect they reproduce the chief contention of Arthur Clutton-Brock's brilliant and deeply moving volume *What is the Kingdom of Heaven?*

Dr. Major, like his predecessor, then faces the question what is the place of Jesus in this presentation; and he answers it in the same way. Admitting that the New Testament is divided on this issue, and that not only the Fourth Gospel but the early Church treated the Divine Sonship of Jesus as primary, Dr. Major urges that this cannot be claimed to be the attitude of Jesus Himself—on the contrary, that He only presents His personal Messiahship as a secret or under direct challenge, and was evidently insistent against making its confession essential. In a crucial paragraph on p. 45 he writes:

> 'From this it is clear that to secure the acceptance of His Messiahship by His hearers was not the purpose of the public ministry of Jesus. The proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom constituted His mission and His message. This being granted, it is evident that Jesus could not have

* *Basic Christianity, The World Religion*, by H. D. A. Major. (Blackwell. 1944. 3/6.)

regarded acceptance of His Messiahship as a needful preliminary for entrance into the Kingdom of God.'

I am bound to add that I could only accept this paragraph myself if the word 'primary' were added before 'purpose' in the first sentence, and if 'essential' were substituted for 'needful' and 'preliminary' printed in italics in the last: and even then I should have to say 'this is only "basic."'

For it is to me an integral part of the message of Jesus that the Kingdom disclosed to men in flowers and birds, in sowers and housewives, the Kingdom which is present within us if we have eyes to see, finds its appropriate and full expression, its perfect symbol and instrument for us men, in the person of the Son of Man. This seems to me not only the teaching of St. Paul and the Fourth Evangelist, but of those earliest Gospel records to which Dr. Major appeals. I cannot therefore accept his alternative, either viceroy or herald: it seems to be now, as it seemed when Clutton-Brock presented it, an unreal antithesis.

This does not mean that the good news is not first a message about God, or that all that Clutton-Brock or Dr. Major has to say about the Kingdom is not true and valuable. Nor does it deny that this truth has been largely ignored and forgotten, overlaid by fantasies and exaggerations and perverted by sophistries and superstitions, and at this moment assailed by the reactionaries of the 'new orthodoxy.' Very certainly this 'basic' element needs reassertion: it should be the starting-place for us as it was for Jesus; and we should accept all those who start with it as our partners in the faith. And no doubt Dr. Major is right that Christianity has now become so intensely involved in secondary and incompatible beliefs and practices that any return to the good news of the Kingdom will necessitate a drastic simplification and renouncing. In that sense I welcome his book and wish for it not only full attention but the widest possible influence. But a Kingdom of God which does not inescapably involve an incarnational philosophy is to me almost a contradiction in terms. That we should promote the understanding and acceptance of such a philosophy most powerfully by the method advocated by Dr. Major, that is, by recovering and reaffirming the 'basic' principles which he advocates, seems to me to be his conviction as it is mine.

CHARLES E. RAVEN.

PROPHECY IN ISRAEL*

A new edition of Dr. Theodore Robinson's book, *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel,* is sure of a hearty welcome. Fortunately we have a very large and a good literature on the prophets in Israel, but the value of this book lies in the fact that it is quite free from theological terminology, and so can be read by the man in the street. Duckworth's series—*Studies in Theology*—are very cheap and useful, and one trusts that under the new Education Act this series will be used in our day schools, and it might with profit be included in the libraries of Sunday Schools, taking the place of 'goody-goody books.' The present book is sound and useful, and gives a rapid review of the goodly company of the prophets of the Old Dispensation. *Daniel* alone is not treated, and rightly so, for his work is apocalyptic rather than prophetic. The book is quite up-to-date, but it is by no means radical, and it gives only what are practically assured results. As Dr. Robertson points out in his preface, in few branches of Biblical study have greater advances been made in the last thirty years than in prophetic literature.

> 'The whole subject of prophetic psychology has been under investigation, and whilst it would be too early to say that the conclusions reached in the following pages are final, it may be claimed that they do fairly represent the trend of present-day thought.'

* *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel,* by Theodore H. Robinson, D.D. (Duckworth. 4/-. 1944.)

It is a far cry from such a seer as Samuel to the finished work of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and Chapter III of this book gives an excellent description of the origin of prophetic inspiration which, probably, came from a state of ecstasy, although when the message of God was delivered the prophets had complete control of their faculties. Dr. Robinson says:

> 'It is at first a little startling to realise that the Ecstatic was the direct ancestor of the Prophets whose words have been preserved for us in the Old Testament. It is true that the impression one receives from a study of the *Nebi'im* is anything but favourable . . . To the superficial mind it would appear at first sight strange that a medium of this type should be employed for such a revelation. Even the thoughtful student may feel something of a shock on realising that men like Amos and Jeremiah were not readily distinguishable by their contemporaries from the Ecstatics whose symptoms resembled that of the epileptic or even the insane . . . The truth of God comes on the world not as a lightning flash, but as the light of the dawn, which shines brighter and brighter till it reaches the full day' (pp. 35-36).

There is a valuable bibliography by the late Dr. A. S. Peake. All subjects owe much to Dr. Theodore Robinson, and the two books he wrote in collaboration with Dr. Oesterly, *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* and *Hebrew Religion,* we often refer to when we are studying Old Testament subjects.

S. H. N. PILCHER.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

SIR,

PENNY BOOKLETS FOR PASTORAL USE

May we draw the attention of your readers, especially the parochial clergy, to the new series of booklets on pastoral subjects which has just been published and which is advertised in this issue. In a Foreword to the first number the Bishop of Truro writes:

> 'I am very glad to take this opportunity of welcoming the whole series. . . . The series bears witness to the importance which Modern Churchmen attach to pastoral work. I hope the clergy will find these pamphlets useful in connection with their pastoral visiting, as well as in the literature rack in their churches.'

The booklets are brief and simple in style. They are written for the laity, and in most cases for the non-church-going laity. Suggestions for further numbers in this series would be welcomed.

W. G. FALLOWS, *Editor of the Series.*
R. GLADSTONE GRIFFITH, *Hon. Sec., M.C.U.*

12th May, 1944.

SIR,

M.C.U. COUNCIL ELECTIONS

May I inform members of the Union that the ten places on the Council, to be held for three years, have been filled by the nomination of the following: Rev. H. Bailey, Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, Rev. W. G. Fallows, M. S. Gotch, Esq., Rev. R. H. Preston, Rev. I. T. Ramsey, Rev. W. Richardson, Rev. C. E. Seamer, Rev. H. J. Truman, Miss M. Irene Walker. There are twelve seats to be filled by co-option for a period of one year.

R. GLADSTONE GRIFFITH,
Hon. Sec., M.C.U.

Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bletchley, Bucks.
May, 1944.